

THE COMMON LIFE IN THE
BODY OF CHRIST

THE COMMON LIFE IN THE BODY OF CHRIST

BY

L. S. THORNTON, D.D., C.R.



dacre press
westminster

first published 1942
second edition 1944

IN PIAM MEMORIAM
CHARLES GORE CR
WALTER HOWARD FRERE CR
PATRUM IN DEO
NEC NON AVUNCULI MEI
FREDERICK WILLIAM FULLER SSJE

PREFACE

The manuscript of the present work was in all essentials completed in July 1939. Some steps towards publication were then taken; but the war brought inevitable delays. During the interval which followed some of the additional notes were re-written and others were added. In all else the book remains practically unchanged. In *The Incarnate Lord* (1928) an attempt was made to relate the revelation of God in Christ to current philosophy. But now another problem presented itself. What if the Gospel becomes obscured by our presuppositions and preoccupations, so that we neither see the scope of its application nor suffer it to speak for itself? The conviction grew that this danger was present in the theological situation of to-day. In particular it became clear that certain aspects of the New Testament were not receiving the attention which was due to them. There could be no further progress, for one mind at least, until some attempt had been made to face this issue. Thus the author found himself launched upon a fresh inquiry into biblical theology which has brought new light upon a number of questions. Among the subjects which have thus been illuminated not the least in importance is that of Scripture itself. Clearer understanding has been reached concerning three aspects of Scripture, namely (1) its function as the medium of revelation, (2) the unity which it manifests and (3) the nature of the authority which it possesses. Subject to these considerations the book may be regarded as, in some sense, a sequel to the previous volume, notwithstanding the change from a philosophical theme to one which is wholly biblical. The conclusions reached are in fact complementary. *There* the argument was directed towards the divine aspect of the Incarnation and its relation to the doctrine of the Holy Trinity. *Here* on the other hand attention is concentrated largely upon the Church and therefore upon the human aspect of the divine-human organism. The relation between the two volumes is indicated more exactly in an Additional Note (pp. 320, 321).

For such an inquiry the author had inevitably to rely at

every turn upon the labours of the biblical scholars. His obligations to some of them have, it is hoped, been made sufficiently clear; whilst they are, of course, in no way responsible for the use to which their contributions have been put. In one case something more than this general recognition is due. Liberal use has been made of Dr. James Moffatt's *New Translation of the Bible*. Frequently the meaning of Scripture has been clarified by this means, as well as by other contributions of Dr. Moffatt to biblical scholarship. On the other hand it has sometimes been necessary to record serious disagreements. These in no way diminish the debt of gratitude to his learning and insight which is here thankfully acknowledged. This work also owes much to the kindness of Father Geoffrey Curtis, C.R., who read the whole in manuscript and who by his penetrating comments succeeded in eliminating some at least of its more obvious blemishes. Finally, publication under the special difficulties of war-time has been rendered possible by the courage and enterprise of the Dacre Press and by the co-operation of Messrs. Robert MacLehose & Co. Ltd. To all concerned the author is sincerely grateful.

The dedication is closely connected with the subject of the book. The three names commemorated symbolize all that has been learnt concerning The Common Life in two Christian families, the one natural and the other supernatural. The last name is that of one who, being by kinship a near relative, also belonged to a sister community, and who in both spheres exemplified the meaning of The Common Life in the Body of Christ.

L. S. T.

MIRFIELD,
Advent, 1941.

NOTE TO SECOND EDITION

A number of small inaccuracies have been eliminated and a new Subjects Index has been included. Otherwise there is no change in this Edition.

L. S. T.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
PREFACE - - - - -	vii
ABBREVIATIONS - - - - -	xii
INTRODUCTION - - - - -	I
Theology and the integration of life—Christological unities of the Church and of Holy Scripture—Plan of the present work	
<i>PART I</i>	
THE COMMON LIFE, HUMAN AND DIVINE	
CHAPTER	
I. ELEMENTS OF THE COMMON LIFE - - - - -	5
The picture of the Church in Acts 2-4—‘All things common’—‘The right hand of fellowship’ (<i>koinonias</i>)—Significance of the ‘common’ (<i>koinon</i>)—Transformation of relationships—The new temple and its sacrifices—The offering of the Gentiles—Other aspects of <i>koinonia</i>	
II. PARTAKERS OF CHRIST - - - - -	34
Participation in the sufferings of Christ—Sharing of liabilities and burdens—Identification with Christ in his Body—Christ as the promised Seed and the One Man in whom we are included—Contrasted aspects of this identification—Romans 6 ⁵	
III. PARTAKERS OF THE SPIRIT - - - - -	66
The meaning of 2 Corinthians 13 ¹⁴ and its connexion with Acts 2 ⁴² —The <i>koinonia</i> of the Spirit in relation to Christ—Romans 5 ¹⁻⁵ —The outpouring of God’s love—Pentecostal associations of Romans 5 ⁵ in Scripture	
IV. PARTAKERS OF GOD’S LOVE - - - - -	96
Pentecost and the death of Christ—The key to Romans 5 ¹⁻¹¹ —The Love of God and the two wisdoms—Exegesis of 1 Corinthians 2—St. Paul’s teaching concerning the adoption of sons—Galatians 4 ⁴⁻⁷ —Meaning of Galatians 4 ⁶ —Its relation to Romans 5 ⁵ and 6 ⁵	
V. PARTAKERS OF CHRIST’S VICTORY - - - - -	127
Our deliverance from the hostile powers—Romans 8 ¹⁻¹⁷ —From slavery to sonship—Our share in the unction of the Spirit—‘In Christ’—‘Christ in you’—‘Crucified with Christ’—‘No longer I’—Transformations of the self in Romans 7 and in Galatians 2 ^{19, 20}	

CHAPTER	PAGE
VI. PARTAKERS OF CHRIST'S SONSHIP - - - - -	156
The divine and human aspects of the <i>koinonia</i> —Sonship in the Son—The witness of the Spirit—The blood of Jesus redeems the Common Life—Sons by election and grace—Ephesians 1 ³ –14—Access to the Father—The consummation of our sonship—Romans 8 ¹¹ –30	
VII. THE NEW BIRTH - - - - -	188
Two aspects of regeneration—Baptism, the New Age and Pentecost—The new birth in relation to (i) the risen Lord and (ii) the divine procreation—Its dependence upon the Incarnate Word and the Holy Spirit—The Lamb of God and the waters of the new creation—John 3 ⁵ –8	
 <i>PART II</i> 	
THE DIVINE-HUMAN LIFE AND THE BODY OF CHRIST	
VIII. THE CONSECRATION OF THE CHURCH - - - - -	221
The Church as the bride of Christ—The Head and the Body—Ephesians 5 ²² –32—The initiation of the Church into the sacrifice of Christ—John 13—The baptismal confession of faith—Significance of faith in the gospel narratives—The Transfiguration and St. John—The revelation of divine glory	
IX. THE RESURRECTION OF THE CHURCH - - - - -	253
The Church and the risen Lord—'One body, many members'—The resurrection of Christ and the risen body—The risen Lord as messianic Head—The tomb and the believer—The initiation of the Church into death and resurrection	
<i>Additional Note A:</i> St. Paul on the resurrection of the body - - - - - 284	
<i>Additional Note B:</i> 'A discredited philosophy' - - - - - 286	
X. THE FULNESS OF CHRIST - - - - -	288
The mystical Body further defined by reference to Christ as the Wisdom of God—The doctrine of 'identity in distinction' applied to the new organism—The two senses in which the Church is the fulness of Christ—St. John's Gospel interprets the truth that Christ and the Church are 'one flesh'.	
<i>Additional Note C:</i> The tabernacle in Luke 1 ³⁵ - - - - - 320	
<i>Additional Note D:</i> The organism of the Incarnate Lord - - - - - 320	
XI. THE BODY AND BLOOD OF CHRIST - - - - -	322
The Eucharist at Corinth in relation to current sacrificial ideas and practices—Libation and victim—Body and	

Blood—The One Loaf as <i>koinonia</i> —Its context: (i) The sacred history, (ii) the divine-human organism, (iii) the kingdom of Christ—These interconnexions manifested at Corinth, in the Upper Room and at Capernaum <i>Additional Note E: The Lord's Supper and the Last Supper</i>	354
--	-----

XII. MY FATHER AND YOUR FATHER - - - - 356

'The prayers' of the Church are dominical, scriptural and commemorative—The Lord's prayer and the high-priestly prayer. Significance of John 4 ³⁴ —The focus of Christian worship is that perfected work of sacrifice whereby our priest-king entered into his messianic glory—In the Eucharist an integral relation is effected with all moments and factors of redemptive history <i>Additional Note F: 'We have an altar' - - - -</i>	388
--	-----

XIII. MY GOD AND YOUR GOD - - - - 395

The Son's identification with us in suffering manhood was fitting—'My' and 'your' in John 20²⁷—Sonship revealed through manhood and perfected through suffering—Glory revealed in suffering—Scripture and theology summed up in the 'Johannine' pictures of the Lamb of God—The Spirit leads the witnesses to the Lamb—The Lamb bestows the Spirit and provides the true paschal feast

XIV. THE COMMON LIFE IN THE BODY OF CHRIST - - 425

Sacramental communion is a mystical participation in the sacrificial mission of the Son—Aspects of John 6—The quickening Spirit and the flesh which is of no avail—The <i>scala communicationis</i> —Its twofold description—Its maintenance through the apostolic <i>paradosis</i> —Flesh and glory—The Lamb and the serpent—The Easter sepulchre and the Second Advent <i>Additional Note G: κοινωνία and μετοχή with their cognates</i>	449
---	-----

A LIST OF GREEK WORDS - - - - 452

INDEX (i) References - - - - 453

(ii) Persons - - - - 469

(iii) Subjects - - - - 470

SOME ABBREVIATIONS USED IN THIS BOOK

AV	The Authorized Version of the Bible.
BDB	The Hebrew Lexicon edited by Brown, Driver and Briggs.
<i>Beginnings I</i>	<i>The Beginnings of Christianity</i> , edited by Kirsopp Lake and Foakes Jackson: Part I (The Acts of the Apostles), 5 vols. (Macmillan). See also LC and Tr. LC.
CGT	The <i>Cambridge Greek Testament</i> series of Commentaries (Cambridge University Press).
ET	English Translation.
HDB	<i>A Dictionary of the Bible</i> , edited by J. Hastings.
ICC	The <i>International Critical</i> series of Commentaries (T. & T. Clark).
JAR	J. Armitage Robinson. Unless otherwise indicated, the reference is to his Commentary, <i>St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians</i> ² (Macmillan, 1909).
JTS	The Journal of Theological Studies.
KTW	<i>Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament</i> , edited by G. Kittel.
LC	Lake and Cadbury, editors of vol. iv of <i>Beginnings I</i> (as above).
Tr. LC	The translation of the Acts of the Apostles given in that volume.
LXX	The Septuagint Version of the Old Testament in Greek.
M or (M)	(i) referring to a quotation, indicates that it is taken from Moffatt's <i>New Translation of the Bible</i> (ed. 1935). (ii) after the name of an author, indicates the Commentary by that author in the series based on Moffatt's <i>New Translation</i> (Hodder & Stoughton).
MM	<i>The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament</i> , etc., by J. H. Moulton and G. Milligan (one-volume edition, 1930).
NT	New Testament.
OT	Old Testament.
RP	Robertson and Plummer.
RV	The Revised Version of the Bible.
SH	Sanday and Headlam.
TG ⁴	<i>A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament</i> , by Grimm, translated and edited by J. H. Thayer (4th edition).
W	The <i>Westminster</i> series of Commentaries (Methuen).
WH	The New Testament in Greek according to the text of Westcott and Hort.

Small numerals are used to indicate:

- (i) the edition of the work referred to, when placed after the title or abbreviated reference, e.g. *Römerbrief*⁶, SH⁵, TG⁴, etc.
- (ii) the number of the verse in a chapter of Scripture, e.g. 2 Cor. 5⁶.
- (iii) the number of the column referred to on a given page of a dictionary or lexicon, e.g. HDB, vol. i, p. 460²; MM, p. 473²; TG⁴, p. 240¹.
- (iv) the number(s) of the line or lines referred to on a given page of KTW (see above), e.g. KTW, vol. i, p. 209¹⁰.

Small letters *a* and *b* are used to denote the first and second half respectively of a verse of Scripture.

Abbreviations used for titles of the biblical books are given in the Index under (i) References.

Scriptural quotations inset in small print are taken from RV unless otherwise stated. The spelling of Greek words in NT follows WH.

ἦσαν δὲ προσκαρτεροῦντες
τῇ διδαχῇ τῶν ἀποστόλων
καὶ τῇ κοινωνίᾳ,
τῇ κλάσει τοῦ ἄρτου
καὶ ταῖς προσευχαῖς

INTRODUCTION

Christian thought is in these days undergoing a marked change of emphasis. There is a return from human judgments and experiences to the reality of God disclosed in his acts of revelation and redemption. The modern world was born in a period of emancipation from tradition; and the process of emancipation led to over-simplification in every sphere of thought and life. This happened when increase of knowledge was in fact making everything more complex and difficult. In such circumstances history shows the wreckage of systems built upon inadequate foundations. Clear and distinct ideas have had their day with disappointing results. Our naive and shallow simplicities have not led us to the true simplicity, which is more profound and mysterious. Whilst superficial remedies for the world's ills continue to be offered in the market-place it is the part of Christian wisdom to seek recovery in that wholeness of truth which is in Jesus.

To-day men desire the integration of life upon a new basis. But the rival solutions offered cancel one another out; for none of them represents that whole which corresponds to human nature as God intends it. More serious, however, is the fact that this situation is the counterpart of disunity amongst Christians and is closely connected with that disunity. Moreover our present dilemma is one which seems to involve us in a vicious circle. Truth in its wholeness can be rightly apprehended only within a common order of life. This principle holds good alike in human society as such and in the Church of God. For Christians the principle signifies that the broken mirror of Christendom cannot without grave distortion reflect the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ. The Gospel is the true remedy for all our ills; yet that knowledge of God in Christ, wherein eternal life consists, is obscured by the very facts of our present distress. When we look into the New Testament we cannot see its treasures of truth as clearly as we should; for we are all in blinkers which restrict our vision. The way to God is obscured by obstacles which man has created for himself. In some sense, however, this has always been true. So

we must not exaggerate present difficulties or assume that they are altogether peculiar to our own age.

From the beginning it has always been true that the Christian way of life and the convictions with which it is bound up are sustained only by a perpetual and ever-renewed return to the sources of purification and illumination which are in Christ. 'If ye abide in me, and my words abide in you, ask whatsoever ye will and it shall be done unto you' (John 15⁷). The conditions which are here laid down govern, not only the life of prayer, but also our understanding of the Christian revelation. Mystical union of man with God in Christ is the fundamental basis of our insight into the truth of that revelation. This illustrates the meaning of St. Paul's phrase: 'faith working through love.' The faith which not only justifies, but also prevails in prayer and overcomes the world, does so because (and so far as) it is found in those who know the love of Christ and share his thoughts through abiding in him. The mystical aspect of the Church as Christ's Body must be held to be its primary aspect. This fact has certainly not received adequate recognition in the modern centuries.

In the disintegration of western thought the Church has been treated as a sociological entity; its human, visible aspects have become separated in idea from its mystical and divine aspects. This dichotomy lies at the root of all our western divisions, and appears to be reproduced in them all. Thus the conception of a single divine-human organism reaching from heaven to earth tends to be broken up into compartments between which a great gulf is fixed. In the result the proportions of truth suffer and every element of the whole gets out of focus. Whether the earthly, visible, part is thought of in 'Catholic' or in 'Protestant' terms the result is a grievous impoverishment. Moreover 'piety' and 'mysticism' become individual and isolated, instead of being the salt of a common life which is both divine and human because it is rooted in Christ. Such considerations have decided both the subject-matter and the plan of the present work. Something must now be said about the method of treatment adopted.

This book is concerned with the theological foundations of the Church as they appear in the New Testament. It belongs to the sphere of biblical theology. Attention has been paid, not

only to the biblical matters discussed, but also, as far as possible, to the characteristic forms of thought and language in which they are set forth in the New Testament. To have entered, however slightly, into such a field of inquiry was to explore strange paths leading into an inexhaustible subject. Yet the student of Christian doctrine cannot evade the task of reaching conclusions about the results of biblical study. For the traditions of Christian thought through the centuries are like diverse fountains of waters which all flow from the same biblical sources. Such continuity as systematic theology exhibits is wholly dependent upon the original facts as recorded and interpreted in Holy Scripture. Moreover the language of the New Testament is in a peculiar sense 'the language of the Church'.¹ Whenever we substitute for it other language we do so at a risk. The non-biblical language never succeeds in representing adequately all that is implicit in the biblical forms of speech. Yet the process of changing from one form of language to another begins within the New Testament itself. We cannot therefore evade the process, notwithstanding its dangers. The true safeguard lies in the constant submission of theology to the judgement of Scripture as theories are subject to the judgement of facts. But the facts include the forms of thought and expression which characterize the Bible. The contents of the revelation are mysteriously inseparable from the forms in which they are conveyed; and this is true, notwithstanding the fact that within the New Testament itself the forms are already partially transformed by their content.²

Biblical theology is confronted with a further problem. Criticism rightly elucidates differences between the individual authors of the sacred books. These differences must be recognized and allowed for; they must not be submerged in a forced and artificial unity. Yet the Scriptures are also like an orchestra. The peculiarities of individual contributions are balanced by a higher unity pervading the whole. God himself has spoken, and his message is fundamentally one. Moreover, notwithstanding all individual diversities the dominant forms of biblical thought and expression transcend these diversities and have a wider range. They constitute the inspired forms which God himself has chosen for his revelation in history. There is

¹ E. C. Hoskyns, *Cambridge Sermons*

² see below, pp. 188ff

a sense in which the mystical unity of Scripture corresponds to the mystical unity of the Church. These two forms of mystical unity are complementary; each is a necessary presupposition for the right understanding of the other. Each embodies God's self-communication to man in Christ; each attains its true unity only in Christ. There is an indwelling of Christ both in the People and in the Book. A return to the sources of illumination in him is inevitably a return both to the message of Scripture about the Church and to the life of the Church as set forth in Scripture.

Such a return is necessarily a permanent task of the whole Church, to which each of us contributes no more than a minute fragment. The present work has this fragmentary character. It is a study of some of the biblical materials for a doctrine of the Church. The book as a whole starts from the four marks of the Church mentioned in Acts 2⁴² and returns to them in the course of the argument. Two subjects in particular are considered, as the title suggests. The Common Life here treated of is something more mysterious than the visible fellowship of Christians. In Part I its significance is traced from its outward manifestations to its interior character, from its human embodiments to its divine sources. It is participation in the life of God through union with the One Man Jesus Christ (Rom. 5¹⁵). The biblical account of grace shows it to be an activity of the triune God upon and in the life of man. This analysis of the new creation in Christ is closely related to baptism and therefore concludes with an exposition of the New Birth in its relation to the New Age.

In Part II the doctrine of the life shared in Christ is brought into relation to the doctrine of the Body of Christ. The life shared is embodied. The Church is related to Christ as his mystical complement in the one organism of the new creation. This relationship is traced out by reference to the divine acts of redemption and the theological mysteries disclosed in those acts. The Church is thus defined Christologically in terms of the creed and the two greater sacraments. In the beginning the Church entered a baptismal life corresponding to her confession of faith. The essence of this life consists in eucharistic worship, prayer and fraternal love, grounded upon, sustained by, and manifesting, union with the divine-human priest-victim in his eternal sacrifice and in his regnant glory.

PART I

THE COMMON LIFE, HUMAN AND DIVINE

CHAPTER I

ELEMENTS OF THE COMMON LIFE

The subject of this book is that Common Life which Christians share in the Church of God. We turn first to a familiar summary of that life set forth in the Acts of the Apostles (2⁴²): 'They continued steadfastly in the apostles' teaching and fellowship, in the breaking of bread and the prayers' (RV). A more recent translation renders this verse: 'They were regular in attendance on the teaching of the apostles and their fellowship, the breaking of bread, and the prayers.'¹ These words come at the end of the account given in Acts 2 concerning the events of the first Whitsunday. They describe the primitive Church as it was in its first days, immediately after St. Peter's first sermon and the baptism of some three thousand persons which followed. In both of the translations given above the word 'fellowship' is connected with the apostles. Such a connexion there certainly was. But the translations are none the less unfortunate. For they obscure the fact that in the original Greek the word translated 'fellowship' has the definite article. In this respect it corresponds to the three phrases associated with it. What this verse actually tells us is in fact quite clear. It says that the first Christians were occupied constantly with four things, namely: (1) the teaching of the apostles, (2) the fellowship, sharing or common life (*koinonia*), (3) the breaking of the bread, (4) the prayers.

The word *koinonia* represents one of the leading ideas of the New Testament. It has a number of different aspects which we shall have to consider. No single English word is adequate to its meaning. The word 'fellowship' certainly covers a good deal of the ground; but in some connexions it would be misleading. In the story of Acts the company of disciples, upon whom the Holy

¹ LC in *Beginnings I*, iv, p. 27. For abbreviations see above, p. xii.

Spirit had descended, together with their first converts, comprised a new religious group who shared a common loyalty. The twelve apostles formed the human centre of the group. But it was not a merely human fellowship. It was, rather, the sharing of a common life whose source was in God. The conditions under which men entered upon this *koinonia* were clearly stated at the conclusion of St. Peter's sermon: 'Repent, and let each one of you be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ unto forgiveness of your sins, and ye shall receive the free gift of the Holy Spirit' (Acts 2³⁸). The whole of this section of the Acts is occupied with showing that 'the *koinonia*' was something altogether new, originated by an act of God. It came into being (in its full form) through the descent of the Holy Spirit upon the disciples at Pentecost. This event is declared to have taken place in accordance with a promise of the risen Christ and in fulfilment of ancient prophecy.¹ The new *koinonia* also had continuity with the past. At its centre was a body of men who had been in close fellowship with Jesus. Their 'teaching' was about him. If they are called apostles it is because he charged them with a mission, which became effectual in them, and in the life which they shared with others, in accordance with his promise.

So also 'the breaking of the bread' in this community was the continuation of a practice characteristic of the earlier fellowship between Jesus and his disciples both before the Passion and after the Resurrection.² Finally 'the prayers', mentioned last in this summary, appear to have been the temple prayers. The new fellowship was born in the matrix of an older community, the old Israel. There was at first no formal breach between the two. Loyalty to the apostolic fellowship involved allegiance not only to Jesus as the Messiah but also to the God of Israel, and conformity to the institutions of the old covenant. To this picture of the original Christian community one further feature is added in the story. The first Christians 'had all things common' (*koina*). For a time at least community of material goods was practised (Acts 2⁴⁴, 4³²). This was a voluntary movement as the sequel shows (4³⁴⁻⁵¹¹). A sharing of earthly goods is represented as a spontaneous outward expression of their sharing in divine

¹ Luke 24⁴⁹, Acts 1^{5, 8}, 2¹⁶⁻²¹, 33

² For the latter cp. Luke 24³⁰, 41-43, Acts 10⁴¹

things; for 'of the congregation of those who had believed there was one heart and soul'.¹

From the first the new spiritual unity of the community began to have a transforming power over the outward order of its life. The emphasis which the author lays upon this feature of the common life gives it a symbolic importance far outweighing the actual fact itself. This primitive experiment in community of goods must eventually have passed away. From the standpoint of worldly wisdom it was, perhaps, a piece of economic folly. Yet for all that it was a significant landmark in history. For it was the first chapter in a long succession of similar experiments which have filled many pages in Christian history, and which have certainly altered the face of the world. But it was also symbolic in another sense. The relationship in which Christian people have stood to the economic order has changed from age to age. It will doubtless continue to change. But there is a deep unchanging sense in which Christians have 'all things common' here and hereafter.

In this picture of the common life shared by the original Church at Jerusalem nothing is said about one important question. The first Christians expected the speedy return of the Son of Man upon the clouds of heaven to judge mankind and to inaugurate a new world wholly different from the present one. This expectation must have profoundly influenced their whole outlook, as it certainly affected their way of regarding the affairs of daily life. This influence can be seen at work in the minds both of St. Paul and of his converts. It is dominant in his earlier epistles.² Moreover the author of Acts was fully acquainted with this 'eschatological' outlook, as we can see from his account of the apostolic preaching (2¹⁷⁻²¹, 3¹⁹⁻²¹). Yet he says nothing about its relation to that voluntary sharing of property, which he records as an outstanding feature of the common life in the first days at Jerusalem. This silence, however, is in itself significant. The 'having all things common' is represented as being a result of 'one heart and soul' (4³²) rather than of the eschatological expectation. This presentation of the facts seems to be in accordance with reasonable probability.

¹ LC, *op. cit.*, iv, pp. 47, 48

² especially 1 and 2 Thess.; but see also 1 Cor. 7²⁵⁻³⁸, 15⁵⁶⁻⁵⁸, 2 Cor. 5¹⁻⁵, Rom. 13¹¹⁻¹⁴

The sharing of property in home and family is sustained by affection or natural kinship. Otherwise men do not readily share their earthly possessions. Nor would they do so simply under the influence of an expectation that this present world was shortly to come to an end, unless some other powerful motive were present. A conviction that all will soon be over with this life might, of itself, lead men to an intensive exhibition of selfishness. 'Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die' would be a plausible motto.

On the other hand the conviction that this world will soon pass away, and be replaced by spiritual joys far more worth having, might create an attitude of detachment from material goods. By itself, however, it would be just as likely to turn a man into a solitary of the desert as to lead him to practise community of goods with others. The truth is that the eschatological or other-worldly element in Christian faith, both in its primitive form and in later ages, has had a powerful influence in detaching men from material goods. But it has not in itself decided the form in which this detachment should be expressed. There is, however, something else in the very meaning of the Gospel determining the outward forms of the common life and stamping them with a special character. However we define this determining factor, we must recognize that in the first generation of Christian history it was closely bound up with the expectation of a speedy Return of Christ. Yet, as is well known, the spiritual core of this expectation proved capable of surviving the transformation of its original form. The determining factor of the Gospel was nurtured in the swaddling-clothes of a Jewish apocalyptic which it eventually outgrew.¹ So it is probable that in its details the primitive sharing of goods was shaped by the special form of the current expectation. Both were symbolic of realities which lie, not at the circumference, but at the centre of Christian faith and life.

The apostolic writings have a good deal to say about another application of the *koinonia* to material circumstances, namely the collection of money which St. Paul organized in the Gentile churches on behalf of the poverty-stricken Christians of Jerusalem. It is possible that this poverty was directly connected

¹ No single illustration can do justice to the facts. See further below, Chapters VII-IX

with the practice of sharing material goods in common, although this cannot be regarded as by any means certain.¹ However that may be, the collection of money on behalf of the church at Jerusalem was a direct result of apostolic fellowship re-affirmed under difficult circumstances. Some of the original Twelve had once been partners (*koinonoi*) in the business of catching fish. Our Lord had, however, initiated them into a higher partnership, for which they left all to follow him.² There came a time when they found this partnership in the Gospel a more difficult thing to maintain, particularly with regard to the question about terms of admission for Gentile converts. In his Epistle to the Galatians St. Paul tells of a critical meeting between himself and the leading apostles 'of the circumcision', when 'James and Cephas and John gave to me and to Barnabas right hands of fellowship' (*koinonias*). The danger of schism was averted, and a working agreement was reached, which included the proviso 'that we should remember the poor; which very thing I was zealous to do' (2^{9,10}). St. Paul kept to the agreement faithfully. He gave instructions that a collection of money for this purpose should be made in the Gentile churches. In Galatia, at Corinth, and presumably in Macedonia these offerings were to be collected every Sunday. Eventually delegates of these churches went up with the apostle to Jerusalem to make the presentation.³

The whole of this series of episodes is important as illustrating the nature of the *koinonia* and the difficulties with which it was confronted. The collection was in its origin a symbolic gesture declaring the new fellowship between Jew and Gentile in Christ. The natural obstacles to that fellowship being realized were sufficiently overwhelming to make its success seem contrary to all human probabilities. There was apparently no complete agreement amongst the leaders, nor real mutual understanding of one another's aims. Under such circumstances deeds counted for more than words. The collection was the outward pledge of an inward unity, which was as yet perilously fragile. It was a practical attack upon the age-long barriers of exclusiveness. It was therefore certainly appropriate that this contribution from

¹ cp. C. H. Dodd, *Romans* (M), p. 230; and SH, *Romans* (ICC), p. 412

² Luke 5⁷⁻¹¹

³ 1 Cor. 16¹⁻⁴, 2 Cor. 8, 9, Rom. 15²⁶⁻³¹, Acts 24¹⁷

Gentiles to Jews was actually called the (or a) *koinonia*.¹ Thus the collection was, in all for which it stood, an outward sign of the creatively new character belonging to the common life of fellowship between Jew and Gentile.

In this connexion we must now take note of another transformation in outward conditions which opened the way to the realization of that fellowship. The word 'common' (*koinon*) has in English, as in biblical Greek, two very different meanings. It stands for the whole range and significance of the life lived together in society. But it also means the commonplace and vulgar in contrast to the rare and distinguished. For religion there is a corresponding contrast between the profane and the sacred. The 'common', in this derogatory sense, confronts us in the story of St. Peter and Cornelius (Acts 10, 11). St. Peter, asleep upon the housetop, heard a voice bidding him to kill and eat meats forbidden to the Jew. He protested that he had never yet eaten anything common or unclean; to which the voice replied: 'What God hath cleansed, make not thou common.' The vision taught the apostle that he must 'not call any *man* common or unclean' (10²⁸). So by divine overruling ancient barriers of racial exclusiveness and ritual taboo were swept aside at one blow, and a way was opened to universal fellowship.

We are not here concerned with the details of the process by which the Gentiles were finally admitted to full fellowship and spiritual equality with Jewish Christians in the Church of God. Our subject is the significance of the *koinonia*, and at this stage its transforming effect upon the outward order of society. Apart from this transforming influence the whole story of mankind is honeycombed with barriers of exclusiveness, barriers of blood and race, of nationality and colour, of caste and class. Ancient religions, generally speaking, accentuated these barriers and intensified them. For they gave religious authority to primitive systems of physical taboo, which involved a devastating confusion between physical and moral uncleanness. Such purely physical and external tests of conduct, whatever their original function and value may have been, must inevitably become obsolete in course of time. Yet their elevation into rules of religious observance gave them a hallowed immobility. So for

¹ 2 Cor. 9¹³, Rom. 15²⁶; cp. Heb. 13¹⁸. For a similar use of language see 2 Cor. 8⁴, Rom. 12¹³, Phil. 4¹⁵, 1 Tim. 6¹⁸.

Judaism the practice of circumcision, the law of clean and unclean meats, and the elaborate rules against ceremonial uncleanness provided a deep physical gulf separating Jews from the social life of the pagan world. Thus also the special vocation of Israel was providentially protected from alien influences until 'the fulness of the time came.' Side by side with this external separation of holy Israel from the profane world of paganism there was also an internal separation of sinful Israel from the holy God. So in the temple area the wall of separation dividing Jew from Gentile had its counterpart in the succession of barriers which shut out Israel as a whole from the priestly court and the sanctuary, and finally all except one man on one day in the year from the Holy of Holies.

Thus the sacred was protected from the profane in a graded scheme, formal, external and restrictive. The ultimate object of the whole was a holy fellowship of men with God and with one another in nearness to the presence of God. Even the heathen man might enter the fellowship, if he submitted himself to the whole system of external rules and practices which separated the sacred from the profane. In the Christian *koinonia* the whole of this system became obsolete within a generation and was in principle obsolete from the first. In St. Mark's Gospel the declaration that all meats are 'clean' is traced to the words of Christ himself (Mark 7¹⁴⁻²³). Such a revolutionary decision could have come from no other source. But in any case by his death Christ not only rent the veil which separated man from the presence of God.¹ He also 'brake down the middle wall of partition' which separated Jew from Gentile.² The barriers were done away in Christ. What then took their place?

A clear answer to this question is given by St. Paul in a passage of great importance for the Christian conception of *koinonia*:

Be not unequally yoked with unbelievers: for what fellowship³ have righteousness and iniquity? Or what communion⁴ hath light with darkness? And what concord hath Christ with Belial? Or

¹ Mark 15³⁸ and parallels; cp. Heb. 10¹⁹⁻²²

² Eph. 2¹⁴; see the whole section (vv. 11-22)

³ The word *μετοχή* here translated 'fellowship' is a synonym for *κοινωνία* occurring nowhere else in N.T. But its cognate forms appear about fifteen times; see Additional Note G below, p. 448

⁴ *κοινωνία*

what portion hath a believer with an unbeliever? And what agreement hath a temple of God with idols? for we are a temple of the living God; even as God hath said,

I will dwell in them, and walk in them; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people. Wherefore

Come ye out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord,

And touch no unclean thing;

And I will receive you,

And will be to you a Father,

And ye shall be to me sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty.

Having therefore these promises, beloved, let us cleanse ourselves from all defilement of flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God. (2 Cor. 6¹⁴⁻⁷¹)

This passage describes the positive character of the new *koinonia*. The external restrictions of the Mosaic Law could no longer avail to separate Jew from Gentile. That barrier had already been broken down. But the ethical separation between Israel and pagan uncleanness, which those restrictions were intended to safeguard, had not been removed. Its outward conditions were now transformed, that it might continue upon a new basis. Its ethical character was to be marked, not by external rules, but by inward purity. The new fellowship was not, however, a mere ethical society but a church. It was a company of believers, separated from unbelievers and idolaters by their faith in Christ. It was a family which had God for its Father. It was also a shrine or temple in which dwelt the living God. As the old righteousness of legal observance had been replaced by the new righteousness in Christ, so the old temple with its external barriers had been replaced by a new shrine of the living God, which was nothing else than the fellowship of believers. The sacred presence was no longer shut off from the 'common' people, whether Jewish or Gentile. It was made accessible to all in Christ.¹ God dwells in the new community, and the new 'common' life has thereby become sacred. Under the old order nothing was sacred unless it was carefully fenced off from the profane which threatened it on every side. Under the new order all is sacred and nothing is 'common' in the sense of profane, except for him who defiles it by his own sinful attitude.²

¹ cp. Eph. 2¹⁸ and context

² cp. Rom. 14¹⁴, 1 Cor. 10²⁶, 1 Tim. 4³⁻⁵

In the passage which we are considering St. Paul takes it for granted that a number of promises made to Israel have their fulfilment in the Christian Church. Although the disciples, following our Lord's example, continued at first to join in the temple worship, it was soon recognized that the new fellowship of believers was the true Israel of God.¹ Among the promises here appropriated to the New Israel is one from the Levitical code which referred to the tabernacle in the wilderness. This was appropriately called the Tent of Meeting; for 'there I will meet with the children of Israel. . . . And I will dwell among the children of Israel, and will be their God' (Exod. 29⁴³⁻⁴⁵). Again: 'I will set my tabernacle among you. . . . And I will walk among you, and will be your God, and ye shall be my people' (Lev. 26^{11, 12}).² Now the Jewish temple took the place of the tabernacle to which the whole of this Levitical code was originally applied. St. Paul therefore argues that the Christian Church is a temple because it has the presence of God, that presence which was originally associated with the tabernacle in the wilderness. All the promises made to 'the church in the wilderness' (Acts 7³⁸) are now fulfilled in its successor the Church of Christ. Another application of this argument was to be developed later, in the Epistle to the Hebrews, in connexion with the high-priesthood of Christ.

One further aspect of this important passage must be noticed. The passage begins with an emphatic prohibition of partnership with unbelievers. Then a contrast is drawn between the two communities, the Church and the pagan world, the *koinonia* of light and an opposite *koinonia* of darkness. The principle of separation is re-affirmed for the New Israel, although its basis has been changed. Sin has its own outward organization and this is to be shunned. For the children of light there must be no partnership in deeds of darkness.³ The whole passage concludes with the exhortation: 'let us cleanse ourselves from all defilement of flesh and spirit.' Although ancient rules about

¹ Gal. 6¹⁶. The point is argued at length in Gal. 3 and 4; cp. Rom. 9¹⁻¹⁸ and Phil. 3³, and contrast 1 Cor. 10¹⁸.

² The two passages are combined in 2 Cor. 6¹⁶. RV obscures the allusion by not printing it as a quotation.

³ For the *κοινωνία* of sin see Matt. 23³⁰, Eph. 5^{7, 11}, 1 Tim. 5²², 1 John 1⁶, 2 John 11, Rev. 18⁴

the outward conduct of life have been declared obsolete, there is no surrender of the bodily life to the realm of darkness. Sanctification includes body and soul together. The moral laxity of some members of the Corinthian church had already compelled St. Paul to write at length about such matters in an earlier epistle. It is there in fact, in 1 Corinthians, that we find set forth the first full statement concerning the principles of the new *koinonia* and their detailed application. The word itself occurs in the opening paragraph of the epistle.

'It was God . . . who himself called you into fellowship with his Son and in his Son, Jesus Christ our Lord.'¹ This sentence strikes the key-note of all that follows. The first half of 1 Corinthians falls into two parts. St. Paul writes in the first place about the inner spirit of the common life in contrast to sins of the spirit which threaten its unity (chs. 1-4). He then turns to the sanctification of the body and its protection from sins of impurity and the like (chs. 5-7). In these chapters the conception of the Christian temple appears for the first time in St. Paul's writings. It occurs in both of the sections referred to just now, but in significantly different forms. In chapter 3 it follows a section about the work of building which is being carried on in the Church of God. Our Lord is the foundation of that work and St. Paul is a master-builder. Others also are engaged in the work. The quality of their work varies, and this will become manifest when the whole work is tested in the fires of judgement. Then the picture changes. The building is now a temple which is threatened with ruin by the destructive forces of sin:

Know ye not that ye are a temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you? If any man destroyeth the temple of God, him shall God destroy; for the temple of God is holy, which temple ye are. (1 Cor. 3^{16, 17})

The Corinthians are God's sanctuary, in which the Holy Spirit dwells. Yet they are threatening this sanctuary with destruction by their sinful divisions. In short they are endangering the unity of the Church by their vainglory, jealousy and partizanship. This is treachery to the common life. But worse still, it is a form of sacrilege. The holy shrine of God's own Spirit is invaded by a spirit of profanity. Sins against the common life of the Church have a religious significance. For that common life is not simply

¹ 1 Cor. 1⁹ as paraphrased by RP (ICC) *ad loc.*

a human fellowship. It has a Godward aspect. It is a *koinonia* of consecrated persons.¹

In chapter 6 a quite different, yet complementary aspect of the Christian temple is set forth:

Know ye not that your body is a temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you, which ye have from God? and ye are not your own; for ye were bought with a price: glorify God therefore in your body. (1 Cor. 6^{19, 20})

This passage is the conclusion of an argument against licentiousness, and was probably called forth by some perversion of St. Paul's own teaching about Christian freedom. It constitutes a classic statement of the grounds for the Christian doctrine of the sanctity of the body.² Two main arguments are used: (1) The body has been redeemed by Christ. In taking our nature he made the body his own, and through his resurrection we have assurance that God will also raise our bodies to an eternal destiny. (2) As Christians we are spiritually united to Christ, and through that union our bodies have become his members. From (2) it follows that the body of a Christian is a shrine of the Holy Spirit. Its misuse therefore would be a form of sacrilege. From (1) it follows that our bodies are not our own. To misuse them is robbery. For they belong to God, since he purchased them at the cost of his Son's death. In fact the whole man, body and soul, belongs to God. The Christian is God's bondservant and exists only for his service and worship. The body is the instrument through which that service is to be rendered.

A comparison of the two passages in 1 Corinthians, which have just been considered, will suggest the conclusion that the temple of the Holy Spirit is human nature as redeemed by Christ. Of this two aspects are selected for emphasis in the passages in question. In chapter 3 the temple is the redeemed society, whose common life has been threatened by sins of pride and self-assertion; just as in 2 Corinthians 6¹⁴⁻⁷¹ the temple is the redeemed society of believers in contrast to the heathen society surrounding it. Now since nothing of God's creation is 'common

¹ The rendering in RV margin: 'and such are ye', whether correct or not, brings out this point that the temple is composed of *ἅγιοι*, cp. in this epistle 1³, 6¹¹, 2, 11

² The complete argument covers vv. 12-20

or unclean' (Acts 11⁸) all that belongs to the believer's life belongs to the sacredness of the Christian temple. This includes the body, the outward form of personality, through which there is participation in the outward life.¹ In the biblical and Christian view soul and body make one personality. The soul therefore can be defiled through misuse of the body. Moreover the particular sin which St. Paul attacks in the second passage is a misuse of the body, precisely because (as he shows) it involves a disastrous perversion and disintegration of spiritual relationships. It is an offence against the Common Life in which all spiritual relationships are sanctified.² Thus there is an intimate connexion between the *koinonia* and the sanctification of the body. These considerations show that there is ample justification for the twofold conception of the temple. The Holy Spirit dwells, not only in the society, but also in the individual, who is an indivisible whole. Similar ideas occur in Ephesians 2¹⁹⁻²² and in 1 Peter 2^{4ff}.³

In this inquiry into the New Testament conception of the *koinonia* two points have emerged: (1) On the one hand the *koinonia* is a focus of new relationships between God and man in Christ. It is not simply a new type of human fellowship. Its distinctive character is wholly derived from the fact that it is a fellowship, not only of man with man, but also of man with God. It is an expression of the fact that God has tabernacled amongst men in a new way inaugurated by the Incarnation.⁴ (2) Secondly, in this new focus of relationships there has taken place and is taking place a transformation of one particular relationship, namely, that which connects the inward life with its outward manifestations, the inner spirit with its outward organs and embodiments. The reality of this transformation has appeared noticeably in three connexions. The first of these was seen in the attempt of the primitive Christian community to express their unity of spirit in a sharing of material goods. A little later that unity was again expressed in the collection

¹ On 'body' in 1 Cor. 6 see further pp. 253ff

² The positive side of the argument, the sanctification of human marriage in Christ, is considered in the following chapter (1 Cor. 7)

³ In Eph. 2 the metaphor of building is combined with that of bodily growth. This is also implied in the 'living stones' of 1 Pet. 2^{4ff}.

⁴ John 1¹⁴; see below, Chapter X, pp. 313ff

for the poor of Jerusalem. The second example of the transformation appeared in the declaration that nothing material is 'common or unclean'. The third example is to be seen in the Christian doctrine of the body and its significance as stated in 1 Corinthians 6¹²⁻²⁰.

Now these two principles of the new relationships and their transformed conditions are crystallized in the twofold doctrine of the Christian temple. On the one hand the new *koinonia* is created by God's presence in a redeemed humanity which exists for his service and worship. On the other hand redemption has transformed the relations between God and man, and therefore also the conditions under which God dwells among men. For the peculiar change in the relations between the inward and the outward factors of life, of which three examples have been given, is part of a vaster and even more mysterious transformation of all relationships, which characterizes the Christian way of life. Moreover, one purpose for which temples existed in all ancient religions was to secure a *locus* of the sacred, a place fenced off from the profane. The Gospel, however, secured a transformation of the relations between the sacred and the profane. The separation between them was transferred from a physical to an ethical basis. This change did not involve the substitution of a spiritual order for a material. The relation between the two orders had hitherto been one of fixed uniformity, the spiritual order being tied down to unvarying rules of physical procedure. This relation was now secured by subordinating the material order to the spiritual principles which it should express and manifest.

We must now turn to some further details in the argument about the sanctity of the body (1 Cor. 6¹²⁻²⁰). Religion has throughout its history been liable to two typical perversions of the relations between the inward and the outward. Of these one subordinates the inner reality to external formalities and ceremonial rules of procedure; the other sanctions antinomian licence on religious grounds. Both forms of perversion undergo a radical criticism in the New Testament. It is the second of the two with which we are now immediately concerned. St. Paul countered licentiousness in the Corinthian church with two remarkable sayings: (1) 'Know ye not that your bodies are members of Christ?' (v. 15), and (2) 'every sin that a man doeth

is without the body; but he that committeth fornication sinneth against his own body' (v. 18). The first of these sayings is notable because in it the Pauline doctrine of the Body of Christ appears explicitly for the first time. It is significant, then, that the first appearance of that doctrine should occur in connexion with the spiritual significance of the human body.

The other saying is obscure, but obviously important as it leads up to the statement that the Christian's body is a temple of the Holy Spirit. The meaning is not explicit; but the thought in the apostle's mind seems to be somewhat as follows: All other wrong acts use the body as the instrument of a sinful attitude of the will. But they do not pervert the function of the body itself by the very nature of the act, as do sins of sexual immorality. The apparent exceptions are those other sins of the flesh, like gluttony and drunkenness, which pamper the body, but which do not frustrate its very meaning. Wherein, then, does the distinction lie? Is it not in this, that sexual functions are ideally the direct expression of the unique spiritual relationship of marriage? There is nothing in the appetite for food and drink corresponding to this fact; although eating and drinking, like other forms of physical enjoyment, tend to enhance and promote the social life. In short sex at its highest level expresses the spiritual unity of soul and body in one personality, as no other facts of human nature can do. In an analogous way the mutual correspondence of husband and wife at all levels of human nature makes marriage to be ideally the most intimate expression of man's social nature in the natural community.

The second saying, then, is an application of the truth: *corruptio optimi pessima*. The spiritual significance of the body is most completely revealed in a true marriage. Because the body has such high significance in the order of creation, it is appropriately treated as a sanctuary of the Holy Spirit in the order of redemption. For here a whole world of new considerations arises from the facts of the Incarnation and of our Lord's Resurrection.¹ Through the redemption of the body the relationship between soul and body has been transformed. Consequently the redeemed body has, even in this life, a share in the privileges and graces conferred by redemption upon the regenerate soul. There is an organism of the new creation

¹ see above, p. 15

which is the *locus* of the new fellowship between God and man. From the point of view which emphasizes organic unity in the new creation this organism is fittingly called the Body of Christ. Through union of the soul with Christ (v. 17) the body of a Christian is part of the organism of redeemed humanity. On the other hand from another point of view there has been a new orientation of God and man to one another in a transformed relationship. So the same new organism is fittingly regarded as a sanctuary where God dwells, and where man's whole redeemed nature is consecrated and offered to God in worship.

The doctrine of a Christian temple requires for its correlative a corresponding doctrine of Christian sacrifices. To this subject we now turn, beginning with the words of exhortation in Romans 12^{1,2}:

I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, to present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God, which is your spiritual worship.¹ And be not fashioned according to this world: but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what is the good and acceptable and perfect will of God.

This is one of many passages in the New Testament in which the language of ancient sacrificial cultus is applied to the Christian life and its activities.² Here as in 1 Corinthians 6 remarkable emphasis is placed upon the body. As there the bodies of Christians are members of Christ and temples of the Holy Spirit, so here their bodies are sacrifices. There is, however, a double contrast with the animal sacrifices of the ancient religions. (1) *There* the victim was first slain, and all the sacrificial acts were performed with the carcase and blood of a dead creature. *Here*, on the other hand, the sacrifice is one in which the victim is not dead but alive throughout the sacrificial action. It is an embodied life which is offered. (2) *There* the victim was an irrational animal offered by human beings. The victim did not desire the sacrifice, and could not co-operate in what was done. *Here* the rite is spiritual. It is the appropriate offering of rational beings, who give themselves to the sacrifice voluntarily. Victim and offerer are one person; and (as the next verse shows) the whole personality is involved. The emphasis upon the bodily

¹ RV margin; cp. M: 'your cult, a spiritual rite'

² cp. Acts 24¹⁷, Rom. 15¹⁶, Phil. 2¹⁷, 4¹⁸, 2 Tim. 4⁶, Heb. 13¹⁶, 1 Pet. 2⁵

character of the sacrifice excludes the idea of a contrast between the inward and the outward at this point.¹ St. Paul is not saying that the Christian sacrifice is superior to animal sacrifices because the one is inward and spiritual and the other outward and material. For he also uses sacrificial language about so material an act as the giving of alms.²

The sacrifice is that of the whole Christian life as lived in the body. It is precisely through the body and its weakness that the real friction of life occurs. Living the common life with others is hard, just because spiritual ideals and standards have to be translated into effective outward expression. Our bodies are inadequate to the task. Expression always falls short of desire and intention. Yet the sacrifice is embodied. Otherwise it would be ineffectual. Intentions must be translated into actual deeds; for 'the spirit, indeed, is willing, but the flesh is weak.'³ The sacrifice is living and consecrated.⁴ The whole outward order of life becomes the consecrated expression of a rational self-oblation. That is the standard here set before us. The sacrifice is, therefore, as objective and external as the animal sacrifices with which it is contrasted. On the other hand, those sacrifices merely symbolized in a formal way spiritual realities with which they were not integrated. Such an integration of inward and outward could be realized only if the offerer and the victim were identical. Herein lies the significance of the next verse.⁵

The second verse shows how it is that, although the sacrifice is embodied, the rite is spiritual and rational. If the outward life is to be what God would have it to be, this will involve a transformation of the inward life. We cannot express the divine standard outwardly, unless our minds have become assimilated to that standard. The Christian must therefore be transformed by the renewal of 'his mind',⁶ that is his whole rational and spiritual life. This transformation through spiritual renewal is the indispensable inward condition of the outward sacrifice.

¹ see above, p. 17 ² see below, pp. 24, 25 ³ Mark 14³⁸ ⁴ *M ad loc.*

⁵ The contrast between body and mind in this passage is quite obscured by C. H. Dodd's rendering of the word 'body', (*M*) pp. 190, 90, 91; see the note on *τὰ σώματα ὑμῶν* by SH (ICC) *ad loc.*, p. 352. See also p. 264 of the present work.

⁶ *τοῦ νοός*

Here, once more, we see the new mode of operation by which the inward and the outward are integrated into a single whole in the Christian life.¹ A new relationship is presupposed between God and man—a relationship whereby the spirit of man is renewed. This inward transformation passes into outward expression; and so the whole conduct of life becomes conformed to the divine purpose. Thus the consecrated life becomes an oblation of the entire man offered to God, in accordance with God's good will and purpose for man.

These two verses introduce an exhortation in which the Christians of Rome are summoned to a realization of the common life. Here, as in 1 Corinthians 6, emphasis upon the consecration of the body is connected closely with the doctrine of the Body of Christ. The list of good works encouraged includes 'communicating² to the necessities of the saints' (v. 13). This means 'sharing one's goods with fellow-Christians in need',³ a bodily work of mercy, and a typical corollary of that *koinonia* which involves living sacrifices embodied in the outward life. But this outward sharing of goods is also symbolic of the whole meaning of the common life as described in this chapter. The various spiritual gifts (*charismata*) described are also shared in the sense that each is possessed and used only for the good of the whole Body. In fact none has a right to such gifts as possessions; for they all come from God. Moreover, their differences are due to the act of God by which they are graciously bestowed (vv. 4-6). The relation of the *charismata* to God's grace (*charis*) cannot be reproduced in English. But it provides the key to the meaning of the passage.⁴ If the bodies of the Christians are, not only temples, but also sacrifices, that is because the whole man has been made and redeemed by God. All that we are belongs to him and must return to him in a worshipful life. This also explains the twice-repeated exhortation to humility, which carries with it spiritual sanity and peaceableness (vv. 3, 16).⁵

¹ cp. pp. 15-17 above

² κοινωνοῦντες

³ SH *ad loc.*

⁴ M renders χαρίσματα by 'talents', which he has previously obliterated in its proper setting (Matt. 25¹⁴⁻³⁰). It is difficult to see what is gained. In Matt. 25 'talent' is a sum of money. In ordinary English it is used for any natural gift. The whole point in Rom. 12 is the connexion with 'grace' in the Body of Christ.

⁵ On 'highmindedness' see the profound reflexions of K. Barth (*Römerbrief*⁵, pp. 424ff; ET, pp. 438ff)

The epistles of St. Paul are inevitably much occupied with the peace and unity of the Church, with the problem of maintaining the 'one heart and soul' which belongs to the essence of the common life and which must be sustained and manifested amidst all the varieties of human opinion. At Corinth peace and unity were threatened by party-spirit and partizan attachment to different leaders (1 Cor. 1-4). In the Epistle to the Romans another danger to peace and unity is discussed by St. Paul, namely conscientious differences of opinion about the use of food and the religious observance of days (ch. 14). Such differences might naturally occur in a Church which included both Jews and Gentiles, where old traditions of exclusiveness concerning the 'common' and the 'sacred' were already subject to the dissolving and transforming power of the Gospel. St. Paul deals with these questions on principles which are traced in the Gospels to our Lord's own teaching. With the details of his treatment we are not here concerned. They illustrate aspects of the *koinoma* and its 'edification' which have already been noticed in the present chapter. One point however must be mentioned. The whole discussion is rooted in presuppositions of faith, which may be called Christocentric and even Christological. Thus in the earlier part of the chapter liberty of conscience is supported by reference to the lordship of Christ over the Church. He died and rose again for our sakes; therefore in life or death we belong to him. The relations between the individual conscience and the community are subject to him and meet in him to whom all belong. Just as our bodies are members of Christ and belong to him (1 Cor. 6), so also he is master of our souls. Spiritual liberty in the Church is protected by the sovereignty of the risen Christ and the judgement of God (Rom. 14⁶⁻¹²).¹

So also the principles of brotherly charity laid down in the latter part of the chapter are supported by a reference to the Passion of Christ which rounds off the whole argument (Rom. 15¹⁻³). Mutual bearing of burdens fulfils the law of Christ (Gal. 6²). Self-sacrifice is the heart of the common life, which is founded upon the Cross, even as the Cross itself was a

¹ On the relation between Christ and God in this passage see SH (ICC) *ad loc.*, p. 389, note on v. 10b with its conclusion: 'The union of man with God depends upon the intimate union of the Father and the Son'

fulfilment of the divine plan foreshadowed in Scripture. The frequent use of sacrificial language in writings of the New Testament in reference to the Church, the Christian life and good works always has this ultimate reference to the supreme sacrifice of Christ, even though sometimes the actual terms used had originally heathen associations.¹ St. Paul, in particular, was determined to make his readers realize, in language which their past associations would render intelligible, that the reality for which all priesthood and sacrifice stood was to be found only in Christ and in the fellowship of redeemed humanity. It is not therefore surprising that in the concluding section of this epistle he describes himself (Rom. 15¹⁶) as 'a priest of Christ Jesus to the Gentiles' (M) 'being the sacrificing priest of the Gospel of God'² whose 'aim is to make the Gentiles an acceptable offering, consecrated by the Holy Spirit' (M). Here St. Paul represents himself as a Christian priest standing at an altar engaged in the offering of a sacrifice. The victims of the sacrifice are the Gentile churches. In chapter 12 he had exhorted the Roman church to offer themselves. Here he himself is the priest of the new cultus. There is no inconsistency between these two ideas. If the redeemed community is 'a spiritual house, to be a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God through Jesus Christ' (1 Pet. 2⁵), and if Christ has made us 'priests unto his God and Father' (Rev. 1⁶), then clearly those who exercise ministerial functions on behalf of the Body are exercising a priestly ministry representative of the Whole.³ Such a ministry presupposes the priesthood of all members of the Church. This priesthood has its external and official expression in the ritual acts of the whole Church through the regular ministry. Such ritual acts however derive their whole significance from the sacrificial life of the new creation in Christ. This sacrificial life has its historic origin in Christ's death upon the Cross and its present centre and abiding source in the risen and ascended Lord.

¹ Phil. 2¹⁷ may be a case in point

² So SH translate *ἱεουργοῦντα*

³ And Christ is the whole Body (1 Cor. 12¹²). We are a *ἱερατεῖον ἁγίων* because he is 'the high priest of our confession' (Heb. 3¹). In Part II it will be seen that Christ as the Whole is also the Head; see below pp. 273 ff, 289 ff. 'Representative of the Whole' will depend for its exact significance upon these further distinctions.

In Romans 15²⁵⁻³¹ St. Paul refers to the contribution (*koinonion*) which the Gentile churches of Macedonia and Achaia have made for the poorer members of the church at Jerusalem, and which he is planning shortly to present in person. He speaks of this contribution in terms of an exchange of benefits between the Jewish and Gentile churches. The Gentiles owe a debt to the Jews, which they are now seeking to repay. 'For if the Gentiles were made partakers¹ of their spiritual things, they owe it to them also to minister unto them in carnal things.' The promises of God were made to Israel and came to their fulfilment in the Messiah. 'Salvation is of the Jews' (John 4²²) and the original Christian community was wholly Jewish. From them the Gospel came to the Gentiles through the ministry of St. Paul and other Jewish Christians. For all this the Gentile churches owed a debt of gratitude. Their contribution of money to meet the material needs of Jewish Christians was a sign that they fully recognized this debt. There is obviously here no thought of weighing a material gift in the scales against spiritual benefits. Each side has contributed what it was able to give for those who had it not. This is one more illustration of the principles laid down in chapter 12. The interchanges in the Body of Christ are not merely quantitative but functional. Although there is no longer here as in the first days at Jerusalem a pooling of material possessions, the principle which inspired that action continues to operate. St. Paul had once written to the Corinthians: 'What hast thou that thou didst not receive? But if thou didst receive it, why dost thou glory, as if thou hadst not received it?'² Where all is of God, what each has received is to be used for the benefit of the life common to all members of the Body.

Some of the language employed by St. Paul in verses 27 and 28 has suggested that he looks upon this contribution of the Gentile churches 'as a solemn religious offering'.³ This is supported by what he had just written in verse 16. If he is a priest offering the Gentile churches as a sacrifice, then his presentation of their offerings to the mother church would have a similar character. In the Acts of the Apostles the story of this presentation is clearly so understood.⁴ Similar language is used about the

¹ ἐκοινωνήσαν² 1 Cor. 4⁷³ so SH *ad loc.*, p. 413⁴ Acts 24¹⁷, where the word *προσφοράς* is applied to the collection; see also Heb. 13¹⁶

collection in 2 Corinthians 8 and 9. Moreover, St. Paul certainly applied sacrificial language to a material contribution made to himself by his converts in Philippi.¹ Thus if the language of Romans 15^{27, 28} and probably also certain expressions in 2 Corinthians 8 and 9 are taken to have a sacrificial reference, that conclusion would agree with other available evidence in the New Testament. By far the fullest account of this collection is to be found in the section of 2 Corinthians to which reference has just been made. To this we must now turn.

In 2 Corinthians 8 and 9 St. Paul urges the Corinthians to take their share with other Gentile churches in making the collection for Jerusalem a worthy contribution. He is evidently somewhat anxious about their attitude in this matter. He reminds them that they had shown great zeal, when the proposal was first brought to their notice. They had been first in the field the year before; and he had held them up as an example to the Macedonian churches. These two chapters have been compared to the Epistle to Philemon in the delicate tact which they display. The Corinthians are assumed to be still as eager as ever. Yet they are reminded of the possibility that they may disappoint their apostle. To prevent this happening he is sending three of his colleagues in advance to prepare the Corinthian contribution, so that all may be ready when he comes. He is careful to say that he is not giving them a command. They are not the kind of people who need that. Nor indeed do they really need the reminder! If he holds up before them the example of the Macedonians, this is only to give the Corinthians an opportunity of displaying their own genuine love. A little earlier it was the other way round. The Macedonians had been stirred to zeal by St. Paul's praise of Achaia. So the churches are deftly encouraged to a competition in generosity.

So far, we might feel inclined to say, this is a very clever exhibition of the finer points of Christian courtesy; but is it anything more than that? A deeper note, however, is struck. St. Paul is clearly concerned with the possibility that the Corinthians may miss the opportunity which now presents itself, an opportunity of exercising whole-hearted generosity. It is not the poor of Jerusalem who will lose most, but those

¹ Phil. 4¹⁸

who fail to give as they might. The actual contribution will, if rightly made, be a symbol of something infinitely more important, namely that self-donation in sacrifice which is the very stuff of the Common Life. At the centre of this exhortation to Christian almsgiving there appears a reference to the Incarnation (8⁹), which is introduced almost incidentally to strengthen the appeal which is being made. A question now arises which is of pressing importance for our whole interpretation of the *koinonia*. The question may be stated in this way: Is the fundamental meaning of the appeal in these two chapters primarily ethical? Is the apostle simply saying: 'deny yourselves for the sake of the fellowship between man and man which ought to exist amongst brethren'? And is 'the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ' introduced in 8⁹ simply as the supreme example of such self-sacrifice on behalf of others?

For our present purpose it will be sufficient comment on the interpretation outlined in the last paragraph to say that it is altogether inadequate. But if this is so, if the appeal of the apostle takes us into deeper waters, what is to be the alternative explanation of these two chapters? This question can, in a sense, receive at this stage only a preliminary reply. There are here involved aspects of the *koinonia* which have not yet been considered. Attention, however, can be drawn here and now to certain indications of the deeper problem. The following points may be noticed: (1) the character of the spiritual relationships which lie behind the contribution of money as St. Paul sees it; (2) the manner in which these relationships come to expression in and through the contribution; (3) the remarkable language used, both about the contribution itself, and also about 'the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ.' Finally (4) a certain contrast can be discerned between the 'economic' aspect of the contribution and the spiritual factors involved. It will be impossible to isolate these various issues from one another. They are simply noted as elements which can be distinguished in the argument.

It has been remarked that here and elsewhere St. Paul avoids the explicit mention of money in connexion with Christian almsgiving. In fact he does not call it philanthropy either. He uses a variety of words, nearly all of which have high religious associations in the language of the New Testament. In the passage now under discussion, for example, the contribution of

money is referred to in words, which might elsewhere have as their English equivalents: 'grace', 'communion', 'ministry', 'church service', 'worship' and 'blessing'.¹ He seems anxious to describe the most material facts in the social life of the Church in terms which raise them to the highest level, just as he refers to the bodies of Christians as members of Christ, as temples of the Holy Spirit, and as living sacrifices. Now sometimes this use of language may be connected with the fact that in the Greek Old Testament words, having originally a commonplace or secular meaning, acquired new meanings when they were pressed into the service of Hebrew religion. On the other hand, it seems possible that St. Paul, by his choice of words, was sometimes suggesting deliberately the connexion of commonplace things with the highest mysteries of the Gospel.

An example of this use of language is to be seen in St. Paul's use of the word *charis*. He repeatedly refers to the collection or money as 'this grace', meaning 'this gracious undertaking'.² In the same context he writes about 'the grace of God which hath been given in the churches of Macedonia' (8¹).³ By this he means that the generosity shown by the Macedonian churches was a singular manifestation of the grace of God. Out of the depths of their poverty the Macedonian Christians gave joyfully beyond the limits of their means. Spontaneously they begged to be allowed the favour of sharing in this ministry⁴ (8¹⁻⁴). 'It was their own selves that they gave first and foremost to the Lord and to us'⁵ (v. 5). Behind the contribution lay an act of complete self-surrender in accordance with God's will. The act had more than a social significance. It sprang from religious devotion to our Lord in his Church. It was in harmony with God's will and was a direct product of his grace. The contribution was a concrete expression of the mutual relations of self-giving which belong to the essence of the *koinonia*. Moreover, all such acts have a double reference. Self-giving to the brethren in Christ is self-oblation to God, just as the act itself is made possible by the self-giving of God to us.

¹ *χάρις, κοινωνία, διακονία, λειτουργία, εὐλογία*; cp. the remarks on pp. 24, 25 concerning the language of Rom. 15^{27, 28} and other passages

² 8⁶, 8⁶, 7, 19; cp. 8⁴

³ *χάριν* in both phrases

⁴ *τὴν χάριν καὶ τὴν κοινωνίαν τῆς διακονίας* (8⁴)

⁵ Plummer (ICC), p. 232

It is just here, in this connexion of thought, that the reference to the Incarnation in verse 9 is so significant:

For ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that, though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor, that ye through his poverty might become rich.

The saying sets forth the great exemplar of all Christian generosity and self-sacrifice. Here is the standard and the measure according to which we are to give. So understood the text summarizes the Sermon on the Mount, the New Law of Christ, rather than the Gospel. We are to strive to fulfil this measureless standard, which is none the less the measure of our obligation. If we ask why we should do so, the answer can be found only by drawing out of the text its deeper meaning. The Macedonians were praised because they gave themselves *to the Lord*; and this was praiseworthy (according to God's will) because the Lord gave himself to them. In fact, 2 Corinthians 8⁹ says the same thing as 1 Corinthians 6²⁰. We owe everything to the Lord because he has given everything to us. He gave up all, in order that we might have all. We can never repay that debt. The act whereby he gave all is the supreme revelation of God's grace. Secondly, it is the supreme assurance that this very grace is bestowed upon us. Thirdly, it is the endless source of supply by which our grateful response is created.

The whole meaning of the Gospel, then, lies behind this appeal for a particular act of generosity. Moreover, the *koinonia* which is expressed in the contribution is seen to draw both its substance and its significance from 'the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ', and from the relationships between God and man which that grace has created. But further, these spiritual realities are expressed not only *in* the contribution but also *through* it. This is made clear in the last section of chapter 9 (vv. 6-15). St. Paul here says that if the Corinthians show not a grudging but a generous spirit, this generous sowing will reap its own reward. The giver will be, not poorer, but richer. God will increase the fruits of their righteousness. The cheerful giver has access to a supply of grace which will open to him fresh opportunities and the means to make the most of them (vv. 5-10). Moreover, this spiritual enrichment by which generosity multiplies itself bears another kind of fruit. It generates a flow of thanksgiving to God. The material gift supplies a material

need; but in doing so it also reveals to the recipient the character of the giver. It makes manifest the workings of grace in human hearts. It exhibits the triumphant power of the Gospel. In so doing it opens the heart of the recipient. It fills him with gratitude both to God and to his brethren. It releases a stream of prayer and praise. God is glorified for his work of grace; brotherly love is increased, and with it mutual intercession.

'Ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that, though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor, that ye through his poverty might become rich.' The truth of the Incarnation is here stated in terms of poverty and riches,—that is to say, in terms of those very inequalities of human society which seem to us to manifest the power of evil. In the New Testament the facts of economic and social inequality are treated, not as problems of faith, but rather as opportunities of love. Poverty and riches may be mysterious for faith. They may be occasioned by sin. For the New Testament writers they are simply part of the given facts of this world, upon which the powers of the Gospel are at work. The stubborn facts of this world are in process of dissolution before the redeeming forces of the Age to Come. For Christians the only genuine riches are those which we have together in Christ. Therefore all things are 'common'; and the Common Life is conducted on a basis of equality¹ which is wholly new. If Christians supply one another's bodily needs, it is because all alike are brethren redeemed by Christ, because all alike are called to share the spiritual wealth, which he came to bestow. Evil is not to be identified with material things, but only with our misuse of them. So our Lord spoke of the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven in metaphors drawn from earthly riches. St. Paul here applies the same language to the Incarnation itself.

This use of language is paradoxical and therein lies its value. For it bears stamped upon it an overwhelming contrast between the spiritual realities of the Gospel and the apparently stubborn facts of our economic world. For this great text about our Lord's self-beggary describes the foundation of all Christian self-giving in terms of self-impoveryishment. Yet, as we have seen, St. Paul goes on to show that all such giving is in reality not impoverishment but enrichment.² This paradox underlies a striking passage

¹ ἐξ ἰσότητος (8¹⁴)

² see p. 28 above

in the Epistle to the Hebrews (11²⁴⁻²⁷). Moses is held up as an example of faith because he turned his back upon the wealth of Pharaoh's palace and threw in his lot with the persecuted people of God, 'accounting the reproach of the Christ greater riches than the treasures of Egypt.' In giving up riches to identify himself with the sufferings of Israel Moses enacted a prophetic anticipation of the gracious condescension of the Son of God. So far his story was a type of the Incarnation. He identified himself with the pattern of that great self-impoorishment which was to come. By sharing the agony of God's people he embraced the reproach of the Messiah himself.¹

But further, in so doing he accounted himself enriched. To share the Passion of Christ is to possess something greater than all the wealth of the world. Clearly then these two forms of wealth are utterly incommensurate. In becoming man, says St. Paul, our Lord passed from riches to poverty. In sharing that poverty, says the other writer, Moses became surpassingly rich: 'for he looked unto the recompense of reward' (v. 26). In this too his attitude was prophetic of him 'who for the joy that was set before him, endured the cross, despising the shame' (12²). If St. Paul taught his converts that generous giving enriches the giver, he also tested this principle in his own life, as he told the Philippians: 'What things were gain for me, these have I counted loss for Christ. Yes, verily, and I count all things to be loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord: for whom I suffered the loss of all things, and do count them but dung, that I may gain Christ' (Phil. 3^{7, 8}). The best commentary upon all this is the parable of the Unmerciful Servant with its introductory question and answer.² Fellowship between man and man is upon the same basis as fellowship between man and God. The interchanges of riches in the common life are unlimited in both directions, horizontally and vertically. We know this truth only in Christ and in his Body, in the incarnate Lord and in redeemed humanity. For in both there is one law of life, one pattern of fellowship. If Christian giving is limited quantitatively by the inequalities of this material order, yet in quality and effects it is weighed in non-metrical scales which correspond to the unmeasured laws of love.

¹ cp. Rom. 15³

² Matt. 18²¹⁻³⁵; but see also Mark 12⁴¹⁻⁴⁴

In this chapter we have been considering various aspects of the common life shared in the apostolic church, as set forth in the New Testament. The elements of that life selected for examination were suggested by the use of the word *koinonia* in Acts 2⁴². Thus the common life was seen to be a new fellowship of persons, at one time literally sharing material possessions. Elsewhere and at other times those who belonged to the fellowship were expected to be at least ready to share such things. Clearly this tendency or characteristic was due to their sharing in more important realities, in things which cannot be weighed or measured, such as the Gospel and 'the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ'. In fact the special characteristics of the new fellowship were manifestly derived from its relationship to God. This was a new relationship, described sometimes in terms of the redemptive acts of Christ, sometimes again in terms which refer to the presence and activity of the Holy Spirit.

Now *koinonia* 'involves common and mutual interest and participation in a common object.'¹ The word means 'partnership' or 'sharing' of persons in something.² The present chapter has been concerned to show that the significance of the partnership or sharing which Christians have together is wholly determined for New Testament writers by the nature of that which is shared. On consideration it will be recognized that in any form of partnership there is implied the sharing of more than one kind of thing. For example, all human forms of partnership presuppose in the first place the sharing of a common human nature. This, in turn, provides a basis for the sharing of other things, material or spiritual, or both together. But what differentiates the common life of the Church is neither human nature *as such*, nor things ordinarily shared on the basis of our common humanity. Christians are specifically united neither by material goods, nor by cultural interests nor even by rational ideas. All of these forms of sharing enter into the common life of the Church. But none of them determines its special character.

We have to consider, therefore, what are the objects shared in the common life of the Church, the objects which make that life to be distinctively what it is. This question will be found to

¹ M. R. Vincent (ICC) on Phil. 1⁵ (see *ad loc.*, pp. 6, 7)

² E. D. Burton (ICC) on Gal. 6⁶ (*ad loc.*, p. 336). The comment is made in the course of an examination into the meaning of the verb *κοινωνέω*.

be inseparable from another. We are concerned, in fact, not only with the objects shared, but also with the nature of the process which consists in sharing. We have to ask, not only what is received or possessed or shared by all members of the Church; but also what precisely are the modes by which they partake of, or are caused to partake of things received, possessed or shared. It will be useful therefore, at this point, to give some further illustrations, in order to make clear from the New Testament the kind of distinctions in language which we are now considering.

In a passage in which he contemplates the possibility of his own rejection at the last St. Paul writes: 'I do all things for the gospel's sake, that I may be a joint-partaker thereof.'¹ The Gospel and the blessings which flow from it are here regarded as something in which all Christians have a share. Similarly in another passage the Gentiles are said to be 'fellow-heirs and fellow-members of the body and fellow-partakers'² of the promise in Christ Jesus through the gospel.'³ As sharers of membership in the Body of Christ they also share with Jewish Christians in Christ all that belongs to the fulfilment of the old covenant in the new, including the fulfilment of the promises made to Abraham and to his seed. St. Paul gives thanks for the Philipian Christians, because of 'your fellowship'⁴ in furtherance of the gospel' (Phil. 1⁵). They shared with him in the activity of spreading the good news, probably in part by their financial contributions to his support. On the other hand this shared activity is their response to the grace of God; for 'ye all are partakers with me'⁵ of grace' (v. 7). The Christian life is in part a shared response to God; and again that joint response is called forth by the gracious acts and gifts of God of which we are fellow-recipients.

The Galatian Christians are recommended to share with their teachers: 'Let him that is taught in the word share'⁶ with him that teacheth in all good things' (Gal. 6⁶). Here there is recommended a 'mutual reciprocal sharing, wherein he that

¹ 1 Cor 9³³: *συνκωνῶς* (M: 'secure my own share in it')

² *συνμέτοχα*. On *μετοχή* and cognate forms as synonyms for *κοινωνία* and its cognates, see Additional Note G, p. 448 below

³ Eph. 3⁶; for the thought cp. Rom. 15²⁷

⁴ *συνκωνῶν*

⁵ *κοινωνία*

⁶ *κοινωνέτω*

was taught received instruction and gave of his property.¹ Once more the active sharing is a response, in grateful exchange for their receptive sharing in the word taught. Most of the examples just given show the good news of the Gospel as an object shared in the common life. We recall the picture of the common life with which this chapter began. In its first beginnings, according to Acts 2⁴², it was closely associated with the teaching of the apostles to which the first Christians jointly adhered. In that sense the original *koinonia* was a sharing of all believers with the apostles in the substance of the apostolic message preached and taught.² This sharing of the Gospel, however, may vary greatly in degree according to men's capacity for receiving it. There is a difference both in the kind and in the quantity of food which can be assimilated respectively by infants and adults. So the writer to the Hebrews urges his readers to advance from milk to solid food; that is, from learning the first elements of the Gospel to being themselves teachers of others. 'For everyone that partaketh³ of milk is without experience of the word of righteousness; for he is a babe.'⁴

St. Paul was grateful to the Philippians that they shared his troubles⁵ (Phil. 4¹⁴) partly at least by financial help. But if they 'had fellowship with my affliction'⁶ by their material contributions, they were thereby made fellow-partakers with him in spiritual benefits (vv. 17, 19). Moreover he, in turn, was able to say that he himself sought to know 'the fellowship⁷ of' Christ's 'sufferings, becoming conformed unto his death' (3¹⁰). This subject of partnership in suffering must be reserved for the next chapter. With it we pass from elements of the common life to characteristics of that life as a whole.

¹ Burton *ad loc.*, who compares Rom. 15²⁷; see also Phil. 4¹⁵

² For the content of that message see C. H. Dodd, *The Apostolic Preaching and its developments*

³ ὁ μετέχων

⁴ Heb. 5¹²⁻¹⁴; cp. 1 Cor. 3^{1, 2}. In 1 Pet. 2^{2, 3} the thought is different

⁵ see M

⁶ συνκοινωνήσαντες; cp. the next verse, and on the whole passage see below, p. 44

⁷ κοινωνίαν

CHAPTER II

PARTAKERS OF CHRIST

The doctrine of partnership in suffering receives detailed expression in the opening paragraph of 2 Corinthians. The apostle begins by thanking God for comfort in affliction, because through the divine comfort granted to him in *his* trouble he had been enabled to comfort others in *their* trouble (1^{3,4}). He then continues:

For as the sufferings of the Christ abound unto us, even so our comfort also aboundeth through the Christ. But whether we be afflicted, it is for your comfort and salvation; or whether we be comforted, it is for your comfort, which worketh in the patient enduring of the same sufferings which we also suffer: and our hope for you is steadfast; knowing that, as ye are partakers¹ of the sufferings, so also are ye of the comfort. (2 Cor. 1⁵⁻⁷)

Modern translations obscure the meaning of verse 5 by neglecting the definite article, twice repeated, before the word 'Christ'.² It is the sufferings of the Messiah which abound unto us. These sufferings belonged to a divine plan. They were the necessary fulfilment of that plan as foreshadowed in the Old Testament.³ But the Messiah cannot be separated from the messianic community. So the sufferings of the Messiah 'overflow unto us'.⁴ The necessary law of the messianic life is carried over from the Messiah to the apostle representing him in the community. There is an overflow of the Messiah's sufferings; and the apostle's afflictions are part of that overflow. Messiahship is rooted in suffering and this law continues in the Church.

But there is a further truth expressed in this passage concerning the relation of 'comfort' to 'suffering'. St. Paul began by saying that he had learnt to comfort others in affliction through being himself the object of divine comfort in his own affliction. The sufferer learns to be the sympathizer. Now he passes on to a deeper thought. Comfort comes from the fountain-source of

¹ κοινωνοί

² cp. Plummer (ICC) *ad loc.*, p. 12. On this point see Burton, *Galatians* (ICC), p. 396

³ cp. Luke 24²⁶; Acts 17³

⁴ περισσεύει

the Messiah's sufferings.¹ Christ suffered; and his sufferings are the source from which flows to us an overflowing stream of comfort. But we cannot have the comfort without the suffering. The double stream of suffering and comfort has flowed from Christ to his apostle, and now flows on from the apostle to Christ's other members (v. 6). The double fountain in the Saviour is reproduced in some sense in his servant, and from him passes on to comfort the flock. Finally the apostle's hope for the Corinthian Christians is steadfast, because the double stream abounds in them too. 'Knowing that, as ye are partakers of the sufferings, so also are ye of the comfort.'² There is an identity of suffering sustained from the same source of comfort (vv. 6, 7).³

A similar doctrine is expressed in the Epistle to the Colossians:

Now I rejoice in my sufferings for your sake, and fill up on my part that which is lacking of the afflictions of the Christ in my flesh for his body's sake, which is the church. (Col. 1²⁴)

St. Paul was suffering imprisonment because of his mission to the Gentiles, through which he incurred Jewish hatred and consequent arrest. But he had learnt to rejoice in these sufferings. They were actually a source of 'comfort'. The explanation follows in the next clause. Once he had taught that his 'affliction' was due to an overflow of the Messiah's sufferings. Now however he boldly declares that his afflictions are 'the afflictions of the Messiah'. They are messianic afflictions which declare an identity of life between the Messiah and his apostle. That is what gives him joy. His own flesh is stamped with the messianic pattern of suffering. He is resolved therefore to drink this privileged cup of suffering to the full. There must be no defect in the fulfilment of his apostolic vocation to suffer with the Head on behalf of the Body.⁴

¹ διὰ τοῦ χριστοῦ (v. 5). The full significance of this doctrine depends upon our Lord's Resurrection; see v. 9 and cp. p. 448 below.

² On the plurals 'we' and 'us' throughout this passage cp. Plummer *ad loc.*, pp. 9, 10

³ The variation of order in WH margin (the reading of B and D) gives a lame ending, as it obscures the ground of the apostle's hope

⁴ cp. M: 'all that Christ has to suffer in my person', and see Abbott (ICC) *ad loc.* See further below, pp. 304ff

This doctrine of partnership in suffering has one further corollary. In 1 Corinthians 12²⁶ we read: 'And whether one member suffereth, all the members suffer with it; or one member is glorified, all the members rejoice with it.'¹ The sufferings of one member are shared by all, because the body is an organism which functions as a whole. It follows that in the Body of Christ there are, strictly speaking, no private sufferings. All are shared because there is one life of the whole. Accordingly wrong done to one member is wrong done to the whole Church and therefore to Christ himself. St. Paul's teaching on this matter is identical with that given in the parable of the sheep and the goats.² Christ suffers in his members and they suffer in him. Moreover the *koinonia* of suffering has its parallel in a *koinonia* of glory and joy.³

The same doctrine is taught in the Epistle to the Hebrews. The author reminds his readers of a persecution in which they had 'endured a great conflict of sufferings'. Some of them had suffered themselves in person or property. Others 'had compassion on them that were in bonds', visiting them in prison, and so becoming 'partakers with them that were so used' (10³²⁻³⁴).⁴ This passage should be compared with one in the following chapter, to which reference has already been made (11²⁴⁻²⁶).⁵ When Moses threw in his lot with the oppressed people of God, he shared the reproach of the Messiah. The author evidently holds that already under the old covenant the sufferings of the people of God were one, and that they were also to be identified by anticipation with the sufferings of the Messiah. The corresponding doctrine of *koinonia* in glory is taught in chapter 12²²⁻²⁴.

Again in the next chapter the same writer returns to this language about the 'reproach of the Messiah'. Christians too are to go forth to Christ 'bearing his reproach' (13¹³).⁶ Similar teaching is given in 1 Peter. Christians are not to be surprised, if they suffer persecution, but to rejoice:

¹ RV margin

² Matt. 25^{40, 45}

³ cp. Col. 3¹, Eph. 2^{5, 6}, Phil. 2^{17, 18}

⁴ *κοινωνοί* and *συνεπαθήσατε* are the important words. In English, of course, 'compassion' and 'sympathy' strictly imply that suffering is shared in some degree.

⁵ see pp. 29, 30 above

⁶ cp. Ps. 89^{50, 51}, and see p. 30 above

Inasmuch as ye are partakers¹ of the sufferings of the Christ², rejoice; that at the revelation of his glory also ye may rejoice with exceeding joy. If ye are reproached for the name of Christ, blessed are ye; because the Spirit of the glory³ and the Spirit of God resteth upon you. (1 Pet. 4¹²⁻¹⁴)

This passage reflects a state of things in which Christians are so named by way of reproach. To be known as a Christian meant at least to be subject to the insults of the heathen. The next two verses (15, 16) suggest that to be a Christian was also illegal. Christianity as such was proscribed. To suffer as a genuine criminal is shameful. But if the State treats our Christian profession as a crime, then we must rejoice to be involved in the consequent penalties.

To suffer for the Name of Christ was a privilege, because it meant actual participation in his sufferings. Moreover, these are the sufferings of the Messiah which belong to the pre-ordained purpose of God.⁴ This is a matter, not for shame, but for exultation, because it is the peculiar privilege of the messianic community to be identified with the Messiah. Now the pattern of the messianic life is one of suffering and glory.⁵ To share the suffering is therefore an assurance that we shall also share the glory. Indeed we already have the glory. 'For the Spirit of the glory and the Spirit of God resteth upon you' (v. 14). There is here a double reference. 'The glory' is the glory of the Shekinah which appeared upon the mercy-seat of the ark in the tabernacle and afterwards in the temple.⁶ In the present passage this glory of God's presence is closely connected with the Spirit of God. Secondly, in reference to the Messiah it was written: 'The Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him.'⁷ The Greek version of this text is quoted in 1 Peter 4¹⁴, and applied to the persecuted Christians addressed by the writer. The meaning of the passage we are considering may therefore be summarized as follows: You are the messianic community and you therefore partake of the Spirit which rests upon the Messiah. You are one with Christ in all things messianic. You share the Name, the Glory and the Spirit. In Christ his people

¹ κοινωνεῖτε

² The article is again wrongly omitted by RV

⁴ see above, p. 34

⁶ Lev. 16²; cp. Exod. 40^{34, 35} and 1 Kings 8^{10, 11}

³ τῆς δόξης

⁵ cp. 1 Pet. 1¹¹

⁷ Isa. 11²

are one temple upon which God's Spirit rests, as the cloud rested upon the tabernacle in the wilderness. In this new sanctuary appears the glory of God which is inseparable from his Spirit.¹ Your sufferings, so far from being a matter for shame or distress, are the seal and pledge that all these privileges are yours. For the sufferings and the glory together express the law of the messianic life.

The Epistle of St. Paul to Philemon, short as it is, is a *koinonia* document of great importance. It gives further indication of the deeply transforming powers which were at work from the first in the new fellowship. It illustrates several aspects of the common life already noticed both in the last chapter and in this. The mutual participation of all in the new riches of Christ, in the spiritual privileges of the messianic life, was an immensely potent fact which tended to dissolve barriers of exclusiveness hitherto accepted without question. Where all are members of Christ and have 'put on Christ', 'there can be neither bond nor free' for 'all are one man in Christ Jesus'.² If no man is common or unclean and all things are common to slave and master in Christ, then clearly the institution of slavery as known to history has become obsolete. We are not, however, concerned here with problems of Christian sociology. We must confine our attention to more fundamental issues upon which the solution of such problems will always depend.

In his opening thanksgiving St. Paul prays for Philemon that 'the communication³ of thy faith may become effective' (v. 6). There are details of this verse which are obscure; but the general sense is clear. True Christian faith is living and fruitful. It works through love⁴ and brings forth good works. It has a transforming effect not only upon him who possesses it but also upon his neighbours. Thus the man of faith actively contributes to the common life and its edification. His faith becomes effective through making this contribution. The faith of one thus communicates its power and fruits to the common

¹ It is possible that here, as also in Jas. 2¹, 'the glory' of God is simply identified with Jesus Christ; cp. 2 Cor. 4⁶, John 1¹⁴, Heb. 1³. In Rom. 8⁹⁻³⁰ the Spirit of God and of Christ is associated with suffering and glory (e.g. vv. 14-17); see also 1 Pet. 1¹¹.

² Gal. 3^{27, 28}

³ ἡ κοινωνία

⁴ Gal. 5⁶

life of all. In so doing faith leads its possessor as well as his brethren to deeper knowledge of all good in the things that belong to the Christian life. On the basis of such faith the spiritual interchanges of the common life are made spontaneously as free acts of love¹ (v. 14). This spontaneity within the common life is clearly connected with the possibility of a common mind. Where there is no common mind, there can be nothing but mutual frustration, due to a conflict of purposes. Or else the true unity of the common life must be replaced by an imposed order which is external to the minds and wills of those who obey it. Here spontaneity is entirely dispossessed by passive conformity.

In the primitive Christian community all things were common because there was one heart and soul (Acts 4³²). This was due to the outpouring of the Spirit and all that went with it, including the common attachment of the disciples to the teaching of the apostles about Jesus, and their baptism in his Name. So St. Paul exhorted the Philippians to 'stand fast in one spirit with one soul striving for the faith of the gospel' (Phil. 1²⁷).² Here the object which is to unite believers in one mind is 'the faith of the gospel' for which all share 'the same conflict' (v. 30). Partnership in the Gospel creates a common mind and also the duty of promoting and maintaining a common mind. So St. Paul tells Philemon that he would not make plans for Onesimus, the converted but defaulting slave, without consulting the slave's Christian master. Onesimus is the apostle's spiritual child 'whom I have begotten in my bonds' (v. 10). Philemon is the apostle's partner in Christ (v. 17).³ The delicate tact of this epistle has been compared to that which appears in 2 Corinthians 8 and 9.⁴ In both we see what may perhaps be called the technique of Christian co-operation. Here, as there, the basis of co-operation is to be found in those transcendent realities of revelation and redemption which believers share in Christ. Here, as there, an appeal is made for a free response to the challenge of those given realities shared in common. So the apostle writes as 'a prisoner of Christ Jesus'⁵ gently urging reception of the delinquent as 'a brother beloved . . . in the

¹ κατὰ ἐκούσιον, i.e. as a freewill offering

² cp. Jude²: 'our common salvation'

⁴ see above, p. 25

³ κοινωνόν

⁵ twice repeated: vv. 1, 9

Lord' (v. 16). In the sentences which follow the appeal reaches its climax:

If then thou countest me a partner, receive him as myself. But if he hath wronged thee at all or oweth thee ought, put that to mine account; I Paul write it with mine own hand: that I say not unto thee how that thou owest to me even thine own self besides.
(vv. 17-19)

'Receive him as myself'—this request and all that it represents is in harmony alike with our Lord's teaching and with the doctrine of the one Body. Our Lord identified himself with his disciples and especially with the weaker members of his flock.¹ Moreover, as there is one life shared between Christ and his members, so also the same life is shared between the members of the Body. That form of identification which is affirmed by our Lord's teaching to exist between himself and his disciples clearly prevails also *in some sense* as between one disciple and another. This is a ruling principle in the life of the Body. Christ, whether as the Whole or as the Head, is regarded as representing and standing for all the members in a sense which applies to him alone. Yet each member of the Body has *some* representative functions to perform on behalf of the other members. In a given situation the welfare of the body as a whole *may* depend upon the representative functioning of one member, however lowly its position in the organism. But further, if Christ identifies himself with each of his disciples, then there must be a sense in which each represents Christ to the others. This may be understood in two ways: (1) He who ministers to a weaker member is ministering to Christ himself. But (2) he is also ministering on behalf of Christ, as his representative, to one of his brethren.

St. Paul adds here and elsewhere a further application of these principles. We have seen that, as an apostle, he associates himself closely with his Lord in respect of suffering and the comfort which comes through suffering.² Similarly in 2 Corinthians 8⁵ he associates himself with the Lord in reception of the Macedonians' devoted self-giving.³ A similar idea is present in the

¹ Matt. 25^{40, 45}; cp. Mark 9⁴⁰⁻⁴², Matt. 10^{40, 42} and 18. The whole of the last-mentioned chapter is closely relevant to Philemon. See also the discussions of 2 Cor. 1²⁻⁷ and 1 Cor. 12²⁶ on pp. 34-36 above.

² see above, pp. 34ff

³ see above, p. 27

passage now under consideration (v. 17). If the humblest disciple represents Christ, then *a fortiori* he may represent Christ's apostle, who in turn is Christ's representative to him. Philemon, as a 'partner' of the apostle in Christ, is bound to admit the validity of these principles, and therefore to receive Onesimus with the welcome which he would give to St. Paul. For the partnership of Paul and Philemon is no ordinary human friendship. It is a sharing of things which are also and equally shared by Onesimus. All three are in fact upon the same footing. For all alike are Christ's slaves and prisoners. All have been bought at the price of his blood-shedding. All are in the same relation to him and therefore to one another.¹

One obstacle, however, still remains. Onesimus is in financial debt to his master, whether by theft or by misappropriation of funds. This at least is presumed to be Philemon's view of the matter. St. Paul, therefore, undertakes to pay the debt himself and makes a written promise to this effect in his own hand. Finally a delicate reminder is given that Philemon owes much more than money to the apostle. To one who had brought him the Gospel and made him a Christian he owes nothing less than himself (vv. 18, 19).² St. Paul in fact makes himself a surety for Onesimus. If a young man were in debt to his father's friend and partner, the father would naturally undertake to pay his son's debt, and would expect his friend to refrain from all legal proceedings in order that the matter might be settled privately. That is the situation as the apostle sees it. His spiritual child is in debt to his spiritual partner. The wrong is to be set right on the level of these spiritual relationships. Moreover the creditor also owes more than he can pay to the man who offers to stand surety for his debtor.

The situation is closely analogous to that depicted in the parable of the Unmerciful Servant. In fact the teaching embodied in that parable surely lies behind St. Paul's letter and would be present to the mind of Philemon. If the latter owes his soul to St. Paul what does he not owe to God who has forgiven his sins, to Christ who died for him! For that gracious act of the divine forgiveness was wholly embodied in and conveyed through the life and death of the Son of Man 'who gave his life

¹ cp. 1 Cor. 7^{22, 23}, repeating 6²⁰

² The parallel with 2 Cor. 8⁸ continues

a ransom for many.¹ Moreover the action of the apostle in standing surety for his spiritual child may well have typified to Philemon the action of Christ in standing surety for all of us. In a similar manner there is a sense in which the debt which Philemon owes to St. Paul typifies the infinitely greater debt which Philemon owes to God in Christ,—just as in 2 Corinthians 8 the lesser self-giving of the Macedonians ‘to the Lord and to us’ is set before the Corinthians and so prepares their minds to recall the infinitely greater self-giving of Christ. In the letter to Philemon there is a clear hint of this sequence of thought in verse 20, immediately after the mention of Philemon’s debt to St. Paul. The verse is well rendered by Dr. Moffatt: ‘Come brother, let me have some return from you in the Lord! Refresh my heart in Christ.’ Because the reciprocal self-givings of Christians to one another take place in Christ, that is in his Body, they also represent, sustain, foster and mediate the self-giving of each member to Christ the Head.

The teaching of the Epistle to Philemon is closely similar in tone to a passage in Galatians (6¹⁻⁵). If a brother is betrayed into sin true Christians will do their best to help him back into the right way with gentleness and humility, remembering their own liability to fail under temptation. As mortal men we are all of us liable to give way in the conflict. This weakness of the flesh is a burden which each must bear for himself as he takes up the cross daily and follows Christ. No Christian therefore can without self-deception take pride in his own strength, still less in another’s weakness. What we have to do rather is to share one another’s burdens.² ‘Bear ye one another’s burdens, and so fulfil the law of Christ’ (v. 2). We cannot really bear our own burdens unless we are ready also to bear the burdens of others. For this is Christ’s law of love, which he fulfilled himself in his own life and death. In bearing his own appointed burden, the Cross, he also bore the burdens of all mankind. Comparing

¹ Mark 10⁴⁵; cp. 1 Cor. 6²⁰, 7²³. In the Marcan text the metaphor is that of manumission; cp. 1 Pet. 1^{18, 19}. In Corinthians it is the idea of purchase for possession; cp. Acts 20²⁸, Rev. 5⁹. But, as 1 Cor. 7²² suggests, in our redemption by Christ the two ideas represent two aspects of the same truth; cp. Rom. 6²². For the statement in the text see further Vincent Taylor, *Jesus and his Sacrifice, passim*, and chapter 3 of my book, *The Doctrine of the Atonement*.

² cp. again Rom. 15¹⁻³

Galatians with Philemon, and bearing in mind the closely parallel teaching about partnership in suffering already considered, we may say broadly that the vicarious action of the Redeemer on our behalf sets in motion a corresponding action as between those whom he has redeemed. As our Lord identified himself with us sinners and paid the price of redemption on our behalf, so St. Paul identifies himself with Onesimus, takes over his liabilities and makes them his own. The sinless Saviour bears the burdens of sinners. So too in his degree the apostle, though himself a sinner, yet as partaker in redemption, is able to assume vicariously the burden which was too heavy for Onesimus, precisely because he himself had no share in the defaulting conduct of Onesimus.

About this sharing of liabilities we must say what was also said about the sharing of sufferings. As Christians have all things common in Christ, there are strictly speaking no private liabilities. All are shared because there is one life of the whole.¹ This law of the common life, however, is such that individual character and initiative are invigorated and braced up. If 'we that are strong ought to bear the infirmities of the weak' (Rom. 15¹), this does not mean that the weaker members are to be pampered or drugged.² The rule that 'each shall bear his own burden' (Gal. 6⁵) applies as much to 'the weak' as to 'the strong'. In fact these two classes are not to be thought of as two levels of a caste system with a line between which can never be bridged. The two groups overlap and may even change places under different circumstances. For all 'strength' depends upon God's grace and all 'weakness' may become the occasion and the opportunity for a manifestation of that grace. St. Paul, the strong man, found this to be true in his own case in the matter of the 'thorn in the flesh'.³ A mysterious principle of equality between the members of the Body is always present, a factor to be reckoned with when we least expect it. St. Paul had insisted upon this with regard to material interchanges between Gentile and Jew; but the principle holds good at all levels of the common life:

By equality; your abundance being a supply at the present time for their want, that their abundance also may become a supply for your want; that there may be equality. (2 Cor. 8¹⁴)

¹ see above, p. 36

² as Nietzsche erroneously supposed

³ 2 Cor. 12⁷⁻¹⁰

We have seen that in his request to Philemon the apostle insists upon any action taken being completely free.¹ The same attitude towards the individual's initiative, as something to be jealously respected and safeguarded, appears in his own case when he received a financial contribution from the Philippian Church (Phil. 4¹⁰⁻²⁰).

With complete delicacy he thanks them for their generosity in terms which raise the whole question of such material contributions to the highest spiritual level. He rejoices to receive what they feel able to give because of 'the fruit that increaseth to your account'. But they must not think of him as one whose mind is set upon such material gifts. For he has schooled himself to rise above material conditions: 'I have learned, in whatsoever state I am therewith to be content', for 'I can do all things in him that strengtheneth me' (vv. 11-14). The principle of mutual help is thus balanced by a principle of individual detachment from external circumstances. If their kindness to him may properly be described as 'an odour of a sweet smell, a sacrifice acceptable, well-pleasing to God' (v. 18), his own detachment from material conditions is part of the apostle's fulfilment of the precept which he gave to others 'to present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God, which is your spiritual worship' (Rom. 12¹). Thus the sharing of burdens and liabilities is a sharing of worship in the temple of Christ's Body, a sharing in that supremely sacrificial act in which he bore the burden of our sins upon the Cross (1 Pet. 2²⁴).

This community of sacrificial action between Christ and his people is one in which he took the initiative. The things which belong to the Common Life are the things of Christ, which are shared by his people because he has caused it to be so. Our investigation into things shared has made it clear that there is an identity of pattern as between the life of Christ and the life of the community. As the writer of 1 John puts it: 'As he is, even so are we in this world' (4¹⁷). There is nothing accidental about this identity of pattern. The identity is due to a mysterious identification by which we partake of his life; and this in turn is something of which we may say that it is effected by him, or again that God has effected it through him. He became poor that we might become rich. As the Epistle to the Hebrews

¹ see above, p. 39

represents it: 'Since then the children are sharers in flesh and blood, he also himself in like manner partook of the same'¹ (2¹⁴) with the result that 'we are become partakers² of the Christ' (3¹⁴). By his Incarnation he became a partaker in the things which we share in common, in order that we partaking of his life may share it together. The *koinonia* therefore is the Common Life in this multiple sense. If the new life is common to the redeemed, it is so because, and only because, it is common to the redeemed and the Redeemer. All that is 'common' to man as man he redeemed from being 'unclean' by making it his own in order that his holy life might be common to him and to us and thereby common to us in him.

'It behoved him' therefore 'in all things to be made like unto his brethren' (2¹⁷), yet 'without sin' (4¹⁵). Upon this tremendous excepting clause depends the whole relationship of the redeemed to the Redeemer. Nevertheless even at this point, where the contrast presupposed in the relationship is at its maximum, the law of identification still continues to operate. For the most mysterious text in the Bible states the basis of our reconciliation to God in these terms: 'Him who knew no sin he made to be sin on our behalf; that we might become the righteousness of God in him' (2 Cor. 5²¹). Somehow God identified his Son with our sinful state, in order that we might be identified with God's righteousness in his Son. In this action Christ became our representative³ in the sphere which is utterly alien to him (the sphere of sin) in order that we might enter the sphere which is our true home (the righteousness of God in him).

The difficult text just cited comes at the close of an important group of doctrinal statements throwing light upon the Atonement in more than one of its aspects (2 Cor. 5¹⁴⁻²¹). For the purpose of the present argument we can confine our attention to three verses:

For the love of Christ constraineth us; because we thus judge, that one died for all, therefore all died; and he died for all, that they which live should no longer live unto themselves, but unto him who for their sakes died and rose again. . . .

Wherefore if any man is in Christ, he is a new creature⁴; the old things are passed away; behold they are become new.

(vv. 14, 15, 17)

¹ κεκοινώνηκεν . . . μετέσχευ

² μέτοχοι

³ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν

⁴ RV margin has: 'there is a new creation'

St. Paul is explaining the supreme motive of his life. Probably the first line of the quotation should be rendered thus: 'For the love which the Messiah has for us controls us, convinced as we are', etc. The crucial words are 'therefore all died'. St. Paul submits his whole life to the sovereign control of that love which was embodied in action when the Messiah died for all mankind upon the Cross. The purpose of that act was that the law of Christ's sacrificial self-giving might be reproduced in all for whom he died. Their lives are to be wholly dedicated to him and to his service, precisely as he dedicated himself utterly for their sakes. So far all is clear. But the words 'therefore all died' are more mysterious. They refer, not simply to the consequences of the death of Christ, but to something effected there and then, in and through the death upon the Cross. When Christ died something happened once for all, not only to him who died, but to all for whom he died. They also died with him upon the Cross. In some sense they were identified with him upon the Cross. This doctrine is complementary to that which we have just been considering in verse 21. In that event upon the Cross there was a two-fold identification. Our Lord was identified with us in our sinful state and we were identified with him in his death.

Fuller light is thrown upon this mystery in verse 17. To be a Christian means to be in Christ. To become a Christian means to become a new creature; for in Christ there is a new creation. For those who are in Christ this is the one essential thing.¹ A new life has begun which was created in Christ. The Messiah and his people together form one organism. It was this new organism which was nailed to the Cross and which was afterwards triumphantly raised from the dead (v. 15). To it, in principle, all mankind belongs; and therefore, in some sense, 'the all died' upon the Cross. They were identified with their representative in what he there did for them, just as in that same event he was identified with them in respect of their sinful condition (v. 21). This doctrine is characteristic of St. Paul's teaching. It corresponds exactly to what he wrote in 1 Corinthians (6¹⁵, 12^{12ff}) and in Romans (12^{4, 5}), using the illustration of the body and its members. In particular in 1 Corinthians 12^{12, 13} the 'body' is identified with 'the Christ'. He is the 'one body' into which we all were baptized 'in one Spirit'. The differentia-

¹ Gal. 6¹⁵

tion of Christ as 'the head' of 'the body' does not appear in this group of epistles.¹ The members of Christ are identified with 'the body' but not apart from Christ.²

In the Epistles to the Colossians and the Ephesians 'the body' is identified with the Church, whereas Christ is the Head.³ When the metaphor takes this form the Church is thought of as being in some sense complementary to the Christ. The Church is the counterpart of Christ as his bride, and is described as his 'fulness'.⁴ The Messiah and his people are mutually necessary to one another. It is through them that his mission to the world and in the world will be carried to its fulfilment.⁵ There is a certain messianic identity between him and them. This truth has already presented itself to us in the doctrine of participation in Christ's sufferings. The identity is one of unity in distinction; just as head and members together make one body, and yet remain different in respect of both function and significance. They are different in their functional relation to the body as a whole and to one another. The language of Colossians and Ephesians emphasizes the incompleteness of the Church without Christ. But it also draws attention to the fact of their inseparable unity as a living whole. The body without the head is a headless trunk, a lifeless corpse and mutilated at that. As we have already seen, the Church is described in the New Testament in terms of human fellowship or brotherhood. Yet the *koinonia* language, which emphasizes this, always points beyond it. As soon as we begin to ask wherein this fellowship consists, it is seen to draw its whole character and significance from its relation to God in and through Christ. If, then, we tried to abstract the essential form of the Church from its Christocentric relations, what we supposed we had abstracted would disappear. There would remain something fitly symbolized by a corpse, yet even so incomplete. For apart from Christ the Church would cease to be

¹ In 1 Cor. 11³ the word 'head' is used in a less specific sense; and in 1 Cor. 12²¹ the head is merely one of the superior members

² 1 Cor. 12²⁷, Rom. 12⁵

³ see above, p. 35, on Col. 1²⁴ and cp. Col. 1¹⁸, 2¹⁰, Eph. 1^{22, 23}, 4^{15, 16}; see further, Chapter X

⁴ τὸ πλήρωμα (Eph. 1²³)

⁵ For this aspect of the relation see especially JAR

a human society in any distinctive sociological sense. It would be a fortuitous collection of individuals without any special bonds of unity.¹

Thus whatever developments may be traced in the doctrine of the Body of Christ as between earlier and later Pauline epistles, these are subsidiary to the main conception, namely, that Christ and his people share one single life together after a manner which can be fitly symbolized by the idea of a single human organism. Whatever distinctions are to be recognized, they must be compatible with the notion of a living unity which justifies the language of identity as actually used. Similarly it will be found that however strongly the identification between Christ and his people is asserted, it is never completely unqualified. In 1 Corinthians 12 the members of the body are not Christ; and again in Galatians 3^{28, 29} a similar differentiation appears. The last-mentioned passage must now be considered in detail:

For ye are all sons of God, through faith, in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as were baptized into Christ did put on Christ. There can be neither Jew nor Greek, there can be neither bond nor free, there can be no male and female: for ye are all one man² in Christ Jesus. And if ye are Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, heirs according to promise. (Gal. 3²⁶⁻²⁹)

These sentences form part of a much longer section including about one-third of the epistle, that is, roughly, chapters 2¹⁵⁻⁴⁷. The subject is resumed again from 4²¹ down to 5¹. The whole of the argument covered by these sections is occupied with showing that we are justified by faith in Christ, and not by doing the works of the Law. The argument is based upon an interpretation of the promises made to Abraham, as recorded in the Book of Genesis. (1) The superiority of the Gospel to the Law is prefigured in the story of Abraham, who 'believed God, and it was reckoned unto him for righteousness.'³ Another text, 'In thee shall all the nations be blessed', is understood as foretelling that the Gentiles would be justified by faith as Abraham was. Those who share Abraham's faith are his true children.⁴ (2) The story in Genesis represents God as repeatedly promising an inheritance in Canaan to Abraham

¹ see further, Chapters IX and X

² 3⁶ quoting Gen. 15⁶

³ εἰς

⁴ 3⁷⁻⁹ quoting Gen. 12³

and to his seed. This promise constituted a covenant which could not be cancelled or in any way invalidated by the giving of the Law much later through Moses.¹ In fact a direct covenant-promise of God has higher certainty than a promise made through a mediator as between two or more parties.² The promise to Abraham is fulfilled in Christ, and the Mosaic dispensation is an interlude which cannot affect the main issue. (3) That issue is simply this: Christ is the Seed to whom the promised inheritance belongs. The Promise came true in the Gospel; and all who by faith are joined to Christ have a share in the Promise. (4) The Law had a pedagogic function appropriate to the childhood of God's people. But now in Christ we are come of age and have entered upon our inheritance as God's sons.³

In baptism we 'put on Christ' like a garment. The metaphor is said to mean 'to take on the character or standing of' Christ.⁴ In other words we have become partakers in his messianic status and privileges. All the natural differences of race, class and sex, which in history have been converted into barriers against true human fellowship, exist no longer in Christ; that is they have no significance in respect of a person's status in the new order. One thing alone counts there, namely to share the new unity which exists in Christ. This unity is represented in terms of a single human organism. 'Ye are all one man in Christ Jesus' (3²⁸). Those who in this sense belong to Christ are Abraham's seed; for they are included in him who is the Seed. So they have a share in the inheritance promised to Abraham.⁵

What is the relation of Galatians 3²⁶⁻²⁹ to the somewhat difficult argument from the Old Testament which precedes it? Taking the argument as a whole we recall that the main theme of this epistle is justification by faith and not by works of the law. This involves two factors. Christ is the objective ground and agent of our justification; faith is its subjective condition.

¹ διαθήκη probably means 'covenant' in 3^{15,17}. But it can also mean a 'testament' (a 'will'). In Heb. 9¹⁵⁻¹⁸ the two meanings are combined. See Burton (ICC), pp. 496 ff

² The meaning of 3²⁰ is obscure. Possibly there is a reference to the giving of the law through angels; cp. Acts 7⁵³

³ 3⁶⁻²⁶; cp. 4¹⁻⁷

⁴ Burton, *op. cit.*, p. 204

⁵ 3²⁷⁻²⁹; cp. 4⁷

Accordingly the exegesis of the Old Testament story develops into two theses corresponding to these two factors. (1) The first thesis draws an analogy between Abraham's faith and ours. Abraham is a type of the Christian believer. As he was justified by faith, so are we. We are his spiritual children, because our faith is like his. This truth is actually foretold in the promise made to him. (2) The second thesis explains the rôle of Christ as agent of justification and shows its connexion with the promise to Abraham. The Covenant of Promise prefigured the Gospel of Christ; the Covenant of Law, although serving a necessary purpose, is the antithesis of both. But Christ has delivered us from the Law with its curse and its slavery; he is, therefore, to be identified with that Seed of Abraham to whom the inheritance was promised. We are the heirs of Abraham's faith, because Christ is the heir to Abraham's promised inheritance.

This conclusion, however, only follows if in some sense Christians are included in Christ. Are Christians simply like Abraham in faith, or are they actually heirs to his promised inheritance without the requirement of specifically Jewish qualifications? That was the vital issue, as St. Paul saw it. For him the answer depended upon the truth of two propositions: (a) Christ is the true heir of Abraham's inheritance; (b) Christians are all 'one man in Christ Jesus'. Without verse 16 the conclusion in verse 29 could not follow, and further verses 27, 28 would then become wholly irrelevant.¹ The statement that Christ is the Seed of Abraham to whom the inheritance was promised becomes, therefore, the key to the whole passage. As St. Paul wrote in another epistle, 'How many so ever be the promises of God, in him is the yea' (2 Cor. 1²⁰). Christ is the heir of the Promise, because the whole dispensation of the old covenant comes to its fulfilment in him.² The claim that Christians as such are the true 'circumcision' (Phil. 3³) depends wholly upon their relation to Christ, that is upon the fact that they have become partakers in his messianic status and privileges.

¹ Burton's suggestion that the second half of verse 16 is an editorial addition by another hand must therefore be considered intrinsically improbable; see ICC, pp. 508, 509

² In Ps. 72¹⁷ the promise to the Seed (Gen. 12³) is appropriated to the Messianic King

The passage in Galatians contains a further point of great importance to the doctrine of our participation in Christ as sharers in his messianic inheritance. This is connected with the idea of sonship. The promise was made to Abraham and to his posterity. Under the covenant, title to the inheritance descended from father to son. It depended upon physical descent through Isaac and Jacob. The Mosaic Law however made Jewish privileges depend upon obedience to its precepts. Thus filial privileges were submerged under a contractual status no better than that of slaves; for the contract can never be fulfilled. To deal with this frustration of his covenant God sent forth his Son into this world to become man under the conditions of the Jewish Law, in order to redeem those who were under its servitude and restore them to the status of sons. In the Old Testament Israel is God's son;¹ but this confines filial privileges to descendants of the patriarch Jacob. Thus Gentiles have no natural rights of sonship, whereas Jews have forfeited their inheritance. Through the sending forth of God's own Son and his redeeming work Jew and Gentile alike are now admitted to the status of sonship by adoption. Neither has any right to the title: but in baptism both alike become partakers in the status which belongs to Christ. Sonship belongs to him by right; and in him we are admitted to participation in his sonship (3²⁶, 4^{4,5}), 'so that thou art no longer a bondservant, but a son; and if a son, then an heir through God' (4⁷). This line of thought is once more interwoven with the themes mentioned above by an allegorical treatment of Abraham's family history, with the conclusion that 'we, brethren, as Isaac was, are children of promise' (4²⁸).²

The connexion here made between inheritance and sonship provides a Pauline commentary upon the parable of the Vineyard (Mark 12¹⁻⁹). There the position of the Jews is represented as that of persons who have no right to God's vineyard. They have received the use of it under legal contract and are expected to pay the rent, that is to keep their legal bargain. They break

¹ Exod. 4²², Hos. 11¹

² This final section opens with the shrewd remark that the Law bears witness against itself, since the story of Abraham (from which all these arguments are drawn) is itself included in the five books of Moses (which comprise the Torah); see Gal. 4²¹

the contract and the owner finally sends his only son, the heir to the vineyard, to claim the rent. They murder the heir in order that they may keep the vineyard for themselves. Jesus as God's only Son is the heir, that is to say, the Messiah. He can claim by right that inheritance of which Israel merely had the use. Such an inheritance is his exclusively and none can lay presumptuous hands upon it. Yet God will give it to others. There can be no usurpers; but there will be many fellow-heirs.¹

The argument which we have been following as it is presented in the Epistle to the Galatians was afterwards worked out with much greater fulness in the Epistle to the Romans. The controversy which was at its height, when Galatians was written, had now become less urgent. The short statement in Galatians 3²⁶⁻²⁹, with which we have been mainly concerned, is now greatly expanded, and important new points are introduced. In Romans 4 the analogy between Abraham's faith and ours recurs with some additions. It is pointed out that the justification of Abraham by faith took place before the patriarch was circumcised. Further the faith which he showed concerning the birth of Isaac (beyond all natural probability) is a type of Christian faith in Christ's resurrection. Nothing is said explicitly about Christ being Abraham's seed; but at this point very significant language is introduced, which may well be supposed to imply that very notion. For, in the first place, the seed is mentioned in its more usual significance in reference to the promise that Abraham was to be 'father of many nations'. But this seed could only come through the birth of a son to parents, who were long past the natural age for such an event. The bodies of Abraham and Sarah were as good as dead. Abraham was justified for believing that God could quicken these dead bodies and bring life out of them. Isaac's birth was like a resurrection from the dead; and through that marvellous event there could be a fulfilment of the promises which assigned to Abraham a seed, in number like the stars, consisting of many nations.²

All this, St. Paul says, was not written on Abraham's account alone but also for our sakes.³ In like manner righteousness shall

¹ cp. Rom. 8¹⁷, Eph. 3⁶; see further below, pp. 114 ff

² Gen. 15⁵, 17⁴

³ For a similar use of language cp. 1 Cor. 10¹¹ referring to the 'sacraments' of Israel in the wilderness ('our fathers') as types of the Christian sacraments

be reckoned to us 'who believe on him that raised Jesus our Lord from the dead, who was delivered up for our trespasses and was raised for our justification' (4^{24, 25}). The significance of this passage is twofold: (a) In the first place Isaac born of aged parents is a type of Christ risen from the dead. Through Isaac thus born the manifold seed was to come. Through Christ thus raised the manifold seed *has* come; for Abraham is 'the father of all those who believe' (4¹¹⁻¹⁷). (b) Secondly this conjunction of ideas suggests the statement of verse 25, in which the significance of Christ's death and resurrection is summarized in language drawn from another classic section of the Old Testament, namely the 53rd chapter of Isaiah.¹

We must consider more fully the conjunction of ideas mentioned in the last paragraph. This may help us to understand the connexion which evidently existed in the apostle's mind between the story of Abraham and the picture drawn in Isaiah 53. The following ideas were suggested to St. Paul by the story in Genesis: (i) Abraham was justified because he believed the promise of God that he was to have a manifold seed. (ii) This promise could be fulfilled only through an event which was like a resurrection from the dead. (iii) Justifying faith has for its object a God who can raise the dead. (iv) The manifold seed comes through One whose death and resurrection is prefigured in Isaac. Now in Isaiah St. Paul found the picture of one who 'poured out his soul unto death', but who was destined to survive death, one who 'shall see his seed', 'shall prolong his days' and shall 'justify many'. He shared with the primitive Christian community the conviction that this picture of the righteous Servant of the Lord had found its fulfilment in the passion, death and resurrection of Jesus the Messiah.² But further, he would have found in the prophetic treatment of this theme passages which identify the figure of the Servant with Israel, the chosen people of God. Such a passage as the following, for example, is relevant: 'Thou Israel, my servant, Jacob whom I have chosen, the seed of Abraham my

¹ The ideas of v. 25 correspond to the traditional Hebrew text of that chapter. The word *παρεδόθη* is actually quoted from the Greek text of Isa. 53¹², where it occurs twice.

² 1 Cor. 15^{3,4} probably contains a pre-Pauline formula. The details strongly suggest a reference to Isa. 53; see below, Chapter IX, pp. 257*f.*

friend.¹ In identifying Jesus with the Servant as represented in the latter half of Isaiah St. Paul could hardly fail to notice that he was also identifying him with Israel 'the seed of Abraham'. It follows that in the closing section of Romans 4 the apostle is actually saying something very like what he had written in Galatians 3, when he identified Jesus as the Messiah with that Seed of Abraham to whom the inheritance was promised.

Comparing Galatians 3¹⁶ and 3²⁶⁻²⁹ we must conclude that Jesus is Abraham's seed not simply in his individual character, but as the One Man who includes in himself all Abraham's spiritual children.² But also comparing Romans 4 with the second Isaiah we must conclude that for St. Paul Jesus is the Servant who is Abraham's seed, again not simply as an individual descendant of Abraham, but as including in himself all who belong to the true Israel. What follows in Romans 5 and 6 will be found to corroborate this conclusion. Moreover it is worthy of notice that the very word 'Israel' had this double aspect; seeing that it was, on the one hand, the name given to the individual patriarch Jacob, whilst, on the other hand, it also served as the common designation of the nation descended from Jacob. Apart from other considerations this double meaning of the word would render significant the prophet's conception of Israel the Servant of the Lord, and would be congruous with his picture of a people under the figure of a single individual.

Now there are other pictures of Israel in the Old Testament which represent the people of God in the guise of a single individual. But none of these could, for primitive Christianity, compare in importance with the representation of the righteous Servant in Isaiah 53. Moreover it is clear that not only this chapter but also the latter part of Isaiah as a whole was prominent in St. Paul's mind when he wrote the Epistle to the Romans.³ This is particularly true with regard to his doctrine of justification, which in 4²⁵ is definitely connected with Isaiah 53¹¹. In 5¹⁹ there is no actual quotation; but the language there used makes it practically certain that the author has the same passage in mind. It is to be noticed, however, that in the second Isaiah (1) God first justifies the Servant (50⁸), who is thereby

¹ Isa. 41⁸

² so Burton (ICG), pp. 508, 509

³ cp. C. H. Dodd (M), pp. xxxii, 11-13

enabled to fulfil his mission in spite of the ill-treatment which he receives. Consequently in the final issue (2) the Servant (as God's agent) will justify many (53¹¹).¹ For the New Testament writers the second of these statements was wholly applicable to Jesus. The former text as clearly applies to those who belong to the Israel of God through their membership of Christ.² 'The One Man' Jesus Christ does not need, as we do, justification for sin. For by his obedience we 'the many' are made righteous (5¹⁹) and so (as chapter 6 proceeds to show) are incorporated into Jesus.³ The identification of Jesus with the Servant carries with it the conclusion that Christians are also the Servant, but only as justified by Jesus and included in him, the Many in the One.⁴

This conclusion is actually drawn in Romans 8^{33, 34}, where the apostle applies to the justified members of Christ language clearly drawn from Isaiah 50^{8, 9}: 'It is God that justifieth; who is he that shall condemn?' Language applied to the Servant⁵ is, in St. Paul's mind, suitable to the situation of those who are in Christ, and who are made partakers of Christ's sufferings. This impression is strengthened by the quotation which follows in verse 36:⁶

For thy sake we are killed all the day long,
We were accounted as sheep for the slaughter.

Here the last phrase has close similarity with the language⁷ of Isaiah 53⁷; and the first line of the quotation has parallels in St. Paul's descriptions of his own life of daily dying with Christ.⁸ In the light of the doctrine of the One Man in whom we are all included all that was said earlier in this chapter about our participation in Christ's sufferings has fresh significance. The Church shares with Christ the whole vocation of the righteous Servant in suffering and sacrifice, death and victory. What took

¹ The reader of Romans is reminded that, whereas 4^{25a} quotes from the LXX version of Isa. 53¹², 4^{25b} is based upon the traditional Hebrew text of 53¹¹; see above, p. 53, n. 1

² cp. Acts 13³⁹ ³ cp. Gal. 3^{27, 28}; but see further below, p. 56, n. 2

⁴ cp. 2 Cor. 5^{14, 15}

⁵ With *παρέδωκεν* in 8³² compare Isa. 53⁶ (LXX), and see above, p. 53, n. 1, and below, p. 229, n. 2

⁶ from Ps. 44²²

⁷ *πρόβατον ἐπὶ σφαγῇ*

⁸ 1 Cor. 15³¹; 2 Cor. 4^{10, 11}, on which see Additional Note A, p. 284

place in him as fountain-head takes place in us as in a stream flowing from that source. Moreover, as we learn from 2 Corinthians 1³⁻⁷, what he does in us he can do also through us in others.¹ God uses Christ's members to bring about the justification of others. But this identity of Christians with Christ in his work of justification depends upon the realization in us of the Servant's destiny, with its pattern of sacrifice and victory, of fruitful suffering and conquest through expiation.²

The central section of the Epistle to the Romans (3²⁰⁻⁸) corresponds to the section of Galatians already considered. One particular passage has special relevance for our present purpose:

We who died to sin, how shall we any longer live therein? Or are ye ignorant that all we who were baptized into Christ Jesus were baptized into his death? We were buried therefore with him through baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised from the dead through the glory of the Father, so we also might walk in newness of life. For if we have become united with³ him by the likeness⁴ of his death, we shall be also by the likeness⁴ of his resurrection; knowing this, that our old man was crucified with him, that the body of sin might be done away, that so we should no longer be in bondage to sin; for he that hath died is justified from sin. (Rom. 6²⁻⁷)

This passage, in its whole context, has a close connexion with Galatians 3^{27, 28} on the one hand, and with 2 Corinthians 5^{14, 15} on the other. The points of affinity, however, can be seen clearly only when each of the three passages is related to St. Paul's thought

¹ see above, pp. 34, 35

² cp. Gal. 2^{19, 20}, Col. 1²⁴. The biblical doctrine of justification as exemplified in deutero-Isaiah acquired in St. Paul's teaching a more specific meaning. Through his act of expiation our Lord made it possible for God to declare us 'not guilty', thus releasing us from Law, Sin and ultimately Death (cp. Rom. 3²⁴⁻²⁶, 4²⁵, 6⁷, 7⁴, 8²). But this (1) includes a vindication of God's righteousness, and (2) affects us through our inclusion in Christ (Rom. 3²⁶, 6^{5, 6}, 8¹). Accordingly the vindication in question includes in its scope the vindication of Jesus as the righteous Servant (Isa. 50⁸), and of us only as found in him (*ib.* 53¹¹). Our Lord identified himself with sinners in their need of justification (Gal. 3¹³, 2 Cor. 5²¹, Matt. 23¹³⁻¹⁶). This act of self-humiliation was vindicated by the Father when he raised his Son from the dead and exalted him (Rom. 1⁴, Phil. 2⁷⁻¹¹, 1 Pet. 3¹⁸). So a primitive Christian hymn declared that Christ 'was justified in the spirit' (1 Tim. 3¹⁶). See also below, p. 227

³ *σύνμφυτοι* means 'united by growth with'

⁴ RV margin: 'united with the likeness . . . with the likeness'

as a whole. According to Galatians we become partakers in Christ through inclusion in the One Man by baptism. According to 2 Corinthians we are identified with the One Man in the death which took place upon the Cross. There are therefore two moments of identification between the One Man and the All or the Many. If we had the evidence of the passage in Corinthians alone, we should be inclined to say that for St. Paul there is a simple identity between Redeemer and redeemed at the moment of Christ's death upon the Cross. No other moment for the identification is even hinted at in that context. The event of Christ's death includes 'the all'; and so immediately they are described as 'they which live'. Moreover the identification upon Calvary is again insisted upon in another of its aspects in verse 21 ('made sin on our behalf').

In Galatians, however, with equal clearness the moment of identification is placed at baptism. Here, it must be remarked, the contrast between the two passages in question is not substantially affected by traditional differences between 'Catholics' and 'Protestants' as to the meaning of St. Paul's teaching about baptism and its relation to faith. However that problem be decided, there remains in any case a contrast in the apostle's writings between an identification associated with the death upon Calvary and an identification associated with our entry, as individuals, into the Christian life. There are however indications in both epistles that the two doctrines are not mutually exclusive.¹ There is revealed here, in fact, an important truth about the new organism of the One Man. It may be described as the truth of *double polarity*.² St. Paul's thought moves backwards and forwards from one pole to the other. Sometimes he emphasizes the death upon Calvary as the moment of our identification with the One Man. Sometimes, on the other hand, his thought shifts to the moment of baptism as the crucial point.

In the opening section of Romans 6 the doctrine of Galatians is expanded. Whilst in the main following Galatians, however, the argument of Romans 3-8 restates the doctrine of the One Man in such a way as to include the truth of the view presented

¹ e.g. Gal. 3¹³ is closely akin in thought to 2 Cor. 5²¹, as also is 2 Cor. 5¹⁷ to Gal. 3²⁸

² see below, p. 64, n. 1

in 2 Corinthians. The relation between the three epistles may in this matter therefore be considered to be dialectical. Romans leaves room for both poles of identification within the one organism. This is effected through the introduction of an analogy between Adam and Christ. The analogy had already been drawn in 1 Corinthians 15, and its re-appearance in Romans indicates that it had become a permanent feature of the apostle's thought. In accordance with current Jewish ideas Adam is here regarded as the head and representative of the human race, that is of the natural community. In his story we see the story of our fallen race. 'As in Adam all die, so also in the Messiah all shall be made alive' (1 Cor. 15²²). This sentence is expanded in Romans 5¹²⁻²¹. But the earlier and simpler statement gives the pith of the fuller explanation. The solidarity which is affirmed throughout the Pauline epistles as existing between Christ and his community is thus seen to correspond to another and previous solidarity of the human race.

In Romans 5^{13, 14} and elsewhere St. Paul introduces an important distinction between sin for which a man is personally responsible and sin which has no personal guilt attaching to it. Sin is not simply a series of individual acts, but also a condition of society whose evil consequences spread through the whole race. The race of Adam is like a diseased organism in which the malady spreads from the unhealthy part to the whole until all the members are affected. The *koinonia* of evil bears in this a grim analogy to the Body of Christ, where if 'one member suffer, all the members suffer with it.'¹ What happens to the individual is in such a case not originated by him; yet he participates in the consequences. If we take the figure of Adam as symbolizing the natural society of mankind in its solidarity as a social organism, then St. Paul's analogy between Adam and Christ becomes clear and illuminating, especially when compared with the apostle's own picture of the Body of Christ as the new organism of the One Man Jesus Christ.² In either case individuals enter a system of relationships which they did not originate, but which was constituted by actions other than their own. Yet in either case the individual is identified with the consequences of such acts. In these two organisms there are, as it were, two contrasted biological sequences. Or again we might

¹ 1 Cor. 12²⁶

² 1 Cor. 12¹²⁻²⁷

say that from each fountain-head there flows a stream, one for evil and the other for good. The first stream flows from sin to death, the second from death to life. The sinner as a member of Adam's race falls short of that glory of God for which he was created.¹ He lives 'after the flesh', that is, he lives for the aims of the natural self; and these come to an end with death.² He is therefore under the reign of death, whether he be aware of his situation or not.³ The second stream flows from Christ; its starting-point is his death upon Calvary.⁴ For there 'one man's act of redress issued in acquittal and life for all.'⁵ In his death our Lord identified himself with the evil consequences of our sins⁶ in an act of expiation.⁷ In his resurrection the victorious consequences of this act became manifestly effectual; for his resurrection showed that the reign of death had been brought to an end.⁸ Now all of this Christ effected in his representative capacity, as the One Man who is Abraham's seed, 'Israel my Servant'. By his self-identification with us sinners in his 'act of redress' we may be said to be identified with him in that act. So the language of 2 Corinthians 5¹⁴ is, in an important sense, justifiable and true. It is true, however, precisely because the death of the One already implies its own proper stream of consequences for 'the All', which are described immediately afterwards in the words which follow (v. 15).

Romans 6³⁻⁸, like Galatians 3²⁷, places the individual starting-point of this stream of consequences at baptism.⁹ By our sacramental incorporation into Christ we were 'baptized into his death' (v. 3). Baptism symbolizes death, burial and resurrection with Christ. But not only so; it is the means through which we are actually identified with these events of the messianic life-story (v. 4). This, however, is only the beginning of our personal identification with Christ. Two points arise here: (i) In the earlier group of epistles a contrast is made between union with Christ's death already effected and union with his risen life. The latter is to be attained gradually, and will be completed

¹ Rom. 3²³; cp. 1 Cor. 11⁷

² Rom. 8^{5, 6}

³ Rom. 5^{14, 17a}

⁴ Rom. 4²⁵, 5¹⁰

⁵ Rom. 5¹⁸ M; but see further pp. 68, 69 below

⁶ Gal. 3¹³, 2 Cor. 5²¹

⁷ Rom. 3²⁵

⁸ 1 Cor. 15^{20-22, 45}, 2 Cor. 5¹⁵, Rom. 4^{25b}

⁹ The law of the new life had already been described in Gal. 2^{19, 20}, but without the explicit connexion with baptism.

only at the final resurrection.¹ On the other hand, in Colossians and Ephesians we are already risen and ascended with Christ.² This difference of emphasis must not be unduly pressed. For the other language always implies that the new life has already begun for those who have died with Christ.³ Romans 6 gives expression to the earlier point of view: 'If we have become united with him by the likeness of his death, we shall be also by the likeness of his resurrection' (v. 5). The future tense is again repeated in verse 8. Yet immediately afterwards the apostle tells his readers to reckon themselves 'alive unto God in Christ Jesus' (v. 11) and to present themselves 'unto God, as alive from the dead' (v. 13).

(ii) Secondly, throughout the epistles the transformation involved in union with Christ is stated in two ways. We have died with Christ; therefore we are to live in accordance with that accomplished fact. This distinction is not to be confused with the former point, mentioned in the last paragraph. For example, in Colossians 3¹⁻³ the writer says: 'If then ye were raised together with Christ, seek the things that are above, where Christ is seated on the right hand of God.' We are already risen with Christ; but we are to seek after union with his ascended life. Yet he continues, in explanation: 'For ye died, and your life is hid with Christ in God,' as though we had already attained the goal to which we are to aspire! So again having just said 'Ye died', he goes on to say 'Mortify your members' (v. 5), and, as the margin reminds us, this means that we are to make dead what has already died. Here we see another form of *double polarity*.⁴ From one point of view the great transformation in the Christian life has already taken place once for all in baptism. We have been made partakers of Christ in the fullest sense. 'All things are yours . . . the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come; all are yours; and ye are Christ's; and Christ is God's' (1 Cor. 3²¹⁻²³). These words were written, not to mature saints, but to people whom the apostle had just rebuked in the stinging words with which the same

¹ cp. 1 Cor. 15^{22, 23}; note also v. 49 of the same chapter. We *shall* bear the image of the 'heavenly' Man when we possess a spiritual body.

² Col. 2¹¹⁻¹³, 3¹⁻⁴, Eph. 2^{5, 6}

³ cp. 2 Cor. 5¹⁷; and in Gal. 2²⁰: 'Christ liveth in me'

⁴ see below, p. 64 and n. 1.

chapter opens: 'Ye are yet carnal: for whereas there is among you jealousy and strife, are ye not carnal?' (vv. 1-3). The explanation is that from another point of view the great transformation exists only in germ in each of us. Its fruition lies in the future, and we are summoned to seek that fruition. Moreover this second distinction goes far to explain the variations of language which we noticed in connexion with the point raised in the last paragraph. The difference between the earlier and the later epistles upon the first point is almost swallowed up in this greater issue which now lies disclosed. Those who have died with Christ are to rise with him; those who have risen are to ascend. Yes; but we now see that those who have died, risen and ascended with Christ, have yet to begin the infinite task of learning how to die, rise and ascend with Christ anew!

The whole work of our salvation was accomplished in Christ's death and resurrection. By baptism we were made partakers in the fulness of this salvation. The full fruits of this saving work, for us and in us, still lie in the future. We may gain some help for the understanding of this threefold mystery by considering more fully the language of Romans 6⁵. It is in a sense the heart of the passage which we are examining. Literally translated the sentence runs: 'If we have become united by growth with the likeness of his death, then we shall also be united by growth with the likeness of his resurrection.' The metaphor here is taken from the grafting of trees. A much more detailed use of this metaphor is made in Romans 11^{16b-24} in a somewhat different connexion, which may however throw light upon the present passage.

The prophets Hosea and Jeremiah had likened Israel to an olive tree.¹ The latter wrote: 'The Lord called thy name, A green olive-tree, fair with goodly fruit . . . he hath kindled fire upon it, and the branches of it are broken.' St. Paul adds another episode to Jeremiah's parable. The broken branches are the Jews who have rejected Christ. Addressing Gentile Christians he says: 'Some of the branches were broken off, and thou, being a wild olive, wast grafted in among them, and didst become partaker with them² of the root of the fatness of the olive-tree'³ (Rom. 11¹⁷). The new episode added to Jeremiah's

¹ Hos. 14⁶, Jer. 11¹⁶; cp. Ps. 52⁸

² *συγκοινωνός*

³ M: 'to share the rich growth of the olive-stem'

parable is, of course, clean contrary to nature. St. Paul is fully aware of that, and takes the trouble to mention the fact explicitly (v. 24).¹ The unnaturalness of the operation exactly suits his purpose. For he is saying that the grafting of the Gentiles into the Israel of God is something which could be brought about by no natural factors in history. It was a sheer act of God's grace and power. This point of view is common to New Testament writers. In the story of Cornelius in the Acts the admission of the first Gentile converts to the Church is traced to a special act of God's overruling providence (chs. 10, 11). So too in the Epistle to the Ephesians the union of Jew and Gentile in Christ is regarded as something beyond human anticipation or natural possibility. It is traced back to the act of Christ upon the Cross. There the racial and legal barriers were abolished 'that he might create in himself of the twain one new man . . . and might reconcile them both in one body unto God through the cross' (Eph. 2¹⁴⁻¹⁶). So in the next chapter the truth 'that the Gentiles are fellow-heirs, and fellow-members of the body, and fellow-partakers² of the promise in Christ Jesus through the gospel' is referred to as 'the secret of the Christ', the supreme secret of God's purpose in history, belonging to the secret counsels of God and now made known by revelation to 'his holy apostles and prophets in the Spirit' (3¹⁻⁶). The writer of these two passages builds upon the argument of Romans 1-11 which he so admirably summarizes. Returning to that argument we must notice that Jews as well as Gentiles require to be grafted into the Israel of God. That is the only hope for the branches broken off, a hope whose fulfilment lies within the plan of God's all-embracing mercy.³

In the argument of Romans 9-11 St. Paul felt no need to state explicitly the truth that to be grafted into the olive-tree of Israel means the same thing as to be grafted into Christ. For (1) this important point did not fall within the limited scope of his brief theodicy concerning God's dealings with Israel; and (2) the identification of Jesus Christ with the true Israel is, as previous pages have indicated, implicit in the whole thought of the earlier chapters of Romans, becoming explicit in 4²⁵. We can now return to the grafting which is mentioned in Romans 6⁵. It is clear that this is to be regarded as an act of God's gracious

¹ *παρὰ φύσιν*² *συνμέτοχα*³ Rom. 11²⁸⁻³²; cp. 10¹²

goodness by which sinners, irrespective of their natural status and previous advantages, have been brought into union with Christ. By this union they have been made partakers in the inheritance of the Israel of God and sharers in the life of the One Man, or, as the Epistle to the Ephesians expresses it (2¹⁵), in the 'one new man' which Christ has created 'in himself'. The statement that 'we have become united by growth with the likeness of his death'¹ refers, as the context shows, to baptism, but to baptism regarded as the starting-point of a process. The apostle is saying under a different metaphor what he had already said in verses 3 and 4. The two halves of verse 5 correspond to the two halves of verse 4. The first half-verse in each case refers to the event in which we become identified with the death of Christ. In verse 4a the symbolism of baptism by immersion is treated as an appropriate representation of the spiritual event which is then and there taking place. This is described as a sharing in Christ's death and burial, or, as St. Paul graphically puts it, 'a burying together with him into his death.'² With the change of metaphor the grafting of the neophyte as a new shoot into the holy tree takes place at baptism. The act of grafting is the same as the descent beneath the baptismal waters, when we were buried together with Christ into his death.

But now a new point arises. There are two aspects of grafting. (1) There is first the operation itself by which the cutting is actually attached to the tree in such a way that it can begin to share a common life with it. (2) Secondly there is the consequent integration of the two into one biological whole. This second event can take place only by a gradual process of growing into one another on the part, respectively, of the tree and of its new branch. The traditional controversies about baptism are concerned with this double operation, both with the distinction between its parts and also with the relation obtaining between the two parts or processes. The phrase 'we have become united by growth' exactly expresses the whole operation including both its aspects. The crucial event has already taken place in baptism. Yet the very nature of the operation itself implies that this

¹ Rom. 6^{5a}

² so SH (ICC) *ad loc.* The alternative rendering is: 'buried together with him, through baptism into his death.' In any case baptism signifies a burial which involves a death.

crucial event is a beginning only, the starting-point of a process which must be both gradual and prolonged. For 'union by growth' is something which precisely illustrates *the double polarity of the Christian life* referred to above.¹ That characteristic of Christianity which German theologians call *Einmaligkeit* (once-for-all-ness) is here involved. The messianic events of Christ's death and resurrection took place once for all in history and can never be repeated as historical events. They are characterized, however, not simply by the singularity which belongs to every historical event, nor simply by the finality which belongs to past events as such in virtue of the fact that they cannot be repeated. The messianic events are unique, final and unrepeatable in a sense proper to them alone. For in them the whole plan of God's redemptive action, as unfolded in Holy Scripture, came to its fulfilment. In them, on the Christian reading of history, God did once for all that which, whilst this world-order lasts, will never need to be done again; that which, when this world-order is ended, will be manifestly brought to its fruition.

History is not a mere process, a mere stream of events. It has neither the repetitive character which predominates in events of the order of nature, nor the merely fortuitous character which we relegate to the fantasy or to the fairy-story. History is an organic whole which embodies the purpose of God.² This means that its relevance can be seen only in relation to the end in which that purpose will finally be gathered up and revealed. For Christian faith the meaning of the whole cannot be fully understood until that future goal is reached. But meanwhile we possess a key to the character of that final *dénouement* in the things which God has done once for all through the dying and rising of his Son.³ The messianic events have this 'once-for-all' character, because in them the purpose of God was not merely

¹ p. 60 As already explained, this must be distinguished from *the double polarity of the new organism*. The latter refers not to two poles within the Christian life itself (ground and consequence), but to the relation of the Many members to the One Man (parts and whole). See above, p. 57.

² notwithstanding the conflict with evil, which seems to obstruct that purpose

³ So in Eph. 4¹⁸ the character of the ultimate goal is stated to be 'a mature man', that is, the perfection proper to the new organism in whose life we already share.

exemplified but actually and finally effected.¹ For this very reason they have a unique relation to the history in which they occurred, and which they none the less transcend. But more particularly these events (the death and resurrection of the Messiah) are to be regarded as both transcending and controlling the history of the Church. For the pattern of the messianic life-story is reproduced in the messianic community and therefore also in the lives of its members.² Thus we see how events, which cannot be repeated in the form belonging to them as the historical events of the gospel story, have, none the less, an unchanging significance because of their creative character as acts of God. They are in fact perennial sources from which flow many streams of like events. The human life which has been 'united by growth' with Christ has from the very beginning of that union been made to participate in a whole order of relationships, whose essential form is always 'the likeness' of Christ's death and resurrection. In the present passage, however, a distinction is made. 'We have become united with the likeness of his death' because 'one died for all, therefore all died'³ and 'our old man was crucified with him.'⁴ The death of Christ upon the Cross was the death of the old order to which the natural self of each of us belongs. But his resurrection was the beginning of the new order to which as Christians we belong. In baptism we were translated out of the old order into the new. For us 'the new' has begun.⁵ Therefore 'we shall be also' united with 'the likeness of his resurrection'. Assimilation to the risen life has begun. The fruition of the process is assured. The end will be conformed to the beginning.

¹ cp. E. Brunner, *Der Mittler*, Book I

² On partnership in suffering, see above, pp. 34 ff

³ 2 Cor. 5¹⁴

⁴ Rom. 6⁶

⁵ cp. 2 Cor. 5¹⁷

CHAPTER III

PARTAKERS OF THE SPIRIT

The Epistle to the Hebrews tells us that 'we are become partakers of the Christ' (3¹⁴) and also that we 'were made partakers of the Holy Ghost' (6⁴). Before proceeding further with the first of these two truths it is advisable that we should now turn our attention to the second. For, as we have already seen, the meaning of the term *koinonia*, as applicable to the fellowship of the Church, is to be determined by reference to the new relationship with God which that fellowship implies. The two phrases just quoted from Hebrews remind us that the New Testament refers this new relationship with God sometimes to the action of Christ and sometimes to the Holy Spirit. But there are a number of passages where these two ways of speaking are brought together. One of these 'trinitarian' passages occurs in the last verse of 2 Corinthians:¹

The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion² of the Holy Ghost, be with you all.

Three questions arise about this great text: (1) What is the meaning of the third term ('the communion of the Holy Ghost')? (2) What is its relation to the other two terms? Out of this second question there arises another: (3) Why are the three terms placed in this particular order? Let us consider the last point first of all. Why this particular order? We might have expected 'the love of God' to be put first in accordance with the 'order' of the Persons in the Trinity. That, however, would be to read into St. Paul's mind the formulated thought of later orthodox definitions. Moreover there are reasons which suffice to explain the order actually adopted. In the first place, as the commentators point out, this last verse of 2 Corinthians has no exact parallel elsewhere in the New Testament. There are, of course, other 'trinitarian' passages. But nowhere else in the New Testament does a writer conclude his composition with such a three-fold prayer of benediction. The normal conclusion of the

¹ 2 Cor. 13¹⁴ (in WH, 13¹⁸)

² ἡ κοινωνία

epistles is: 'The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ be with you' or something similar. Sometimes the greeting is longer and sometimes shorter. But always the grace of Christ is invoked. Sometimes the name itself is omitted. For all Christians knew the source of 'the grace' which was invoked upon them in this way. This was the reality which as Christians they knew best of all. 'Ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ' (2 Cor. 8⁹). That, at least, could be taken for granted.

Accordingly the conclusion of 2 Corinthians begins in the same way as the conclusion of all the Pauline epistles. The question, as to why it did not stop short at that point in the usual fashion, is a question which does not admit of any certain answer. It does not concern us.¹ Having begun in the usual way the apostle, for some reason unknown to us, adds the two other terms. Of these 'the love of God', which comes second in order, was mentioned a few lines previously, in verse 11: 'The God of love and peace shall be with us.' There are, therefore, adequate literary reasons for the priority given to the first term, and for its being followed immediately by mention of 'the love of God'. The addition of the third term brought the whole sentence into line with other trinitarian passages in St. Paul's epistles. The exact expression, however,—'the *koinoma* of the Holy Spirit'—occurs in the New Testament only here and, without the definite articles, in Philippians 2¹. These considerations may well provide a sufficient explanation for the order actually adopted. The facts however suggest another consideration which cannot be overlooked. If 'the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ' comes first, because elsewhere it suffices for the conclusion of a Christian letter, is not this in itself a fact of outstanding significance for Christian faith?

'Ye *know* the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ.' That grace was and is the reality which stands nearest to believers in the order of knowledge. We recall the other half of the sentence: 'that, though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor, that ye

¹ The preceding four chapters, believed to have formed part of a separate letter, have a severe tone for which the gentle ending (13¹¹⁻¹⁴) may be intended to make compensation. The suggestion of Burton that v. 14 is an editorial addition (*Galatians*, ICC, p. 509) cannot be disproved, although it does not seem to be required by the facts. In any case the verse forms part of the N.T. Canon, and is a correct summary of St. Paul's teaching.

through his poverty might become rich.' This was what the grace of Christ meant to St. Paul and his fellow-Christians. It was not a mere attitude of benevolence, or of favourable regard; it was a supremely gracious act of self-giving undertaken for the sake of us sinners. This act is likened to voluntary self-beggary, and involved for God's Son that course of self-humiliation and obedience unto death which is the theme of Philipians 2⁵⁻¹¹. In other words 'the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ' means his whole redemptive action as set forth in the gospel story. The good news of this redemptive action was the message proclaimed by St. Paul.¹ It is 'good news', because it is the message which gives us convincing assurance of God's love. Moreover, what we are assured of is no abstraction. It is God's act of mercy and power reaching us sinners in our desperate need.

The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ assures us of the reality of God's love. Because we know the grace, we know the love, not as an abstract idea, but as reality revealed and made accessible. We know God's love because of God's loving act in giving his Son to die for us.² The gracious act of the Son is, therefore, also the act of the Father. For the whole love of the Father is in the Son's act. On this point there is complete agreement between St. Paul and the Johannine writings. But further the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ is to be thought of in terms of 'gift' as well as of 'act'. Thus in 2 Corinthians 8⁹ the gracious kindness of our Lord is defined in terms of a supreme act of devotion, wherein he gave himself at unmeasured cost for our sakes. The grace was manifested and embodied in an act which was complete self-giving. The supreme 'free gift' was the grace. This aspect of grace, as 'free gift', is strongly emphasized in Romans 5¹⁵⁻²¹. There the gift bestowed³ is the new righteousness which is the subject of the epistle as a whole. It is 'the condition of righteousness into which the sinner enters'.⁴ In other words it is justification with all the consequences which flow from it. The gift comes to us 'by one man's act of redress' (v. 18 M), according to one rendering of the phrase, or alternatively 'by one sentence

¹ κήρυγμα (1 Cor. 1²¹) means 'the proclamation' or 'the proclaimed glad-tidings' (RP *ad loc.*, pp. 16, 21)

² John 3¹⁶; 1 John 4^{9,10}

³ τὸ χάρισμα, τὸ δώρημα, cp. ἡ δωρεά (vv. 15-17)

⁴ SH *ad loc.*, p. 140

of acquittal' (cp. v. 16). The former is the act of the Son in dying for us; the latter is the divine sentence of the Father resulting from that death. Justification results from 'the grace of God and the free gift by the grace of the one man Jesus Christ'.¹

In terms of our discursive thought, which cannot escape temporal images, the act of acquittal is the immediate consequence of the act of redress. But for the true meaning of either the two are inseparable. The expiatory action of the Son and the justifying action of the Father are two 'moments' in one divine action.² Of that one divine action St. Paul writes, when he refers to 'Christ Jesus, whom God put forward as the means of expiation by his blood';³ and again, when he says that God 'reconciled us to himself through Christ' and that 'God in Christ was reconciling the world to himself'.⁴ Returning now to 2 Corinthians 8⁹ we notice that the purpose of Christ's gracious act is our enrichment: 'that you, through his poverty, might become rich.' The unanimous teaching of the New Testament refers this enrichment to the gift of the Holy Spirit. At this stage, therefore, the question about the order of the terms in 2 Corinthians 13¹⁴ leads back to the other two questions with which this chapter began.

Those two questions cannot altogether be separated. But it will be convenient at this point to investigate the meaning of the expression: 'the *koinonia* of the Holy Spirit.' Does this mean: 'the fellowship imparted by the Holy Spirit,' or simply 'the participation in the Holy Spirit'? In the former case the *koinonia* is the human fellowship which the Holy Spirit brought into existence, the social entity which has the Holy Spirit for its creative author or fountain-source. In the latter case the Holy Spirit is regarded, not as the subject who brings us together in fellowship, but rather as the object in which we all share, the focus of our common interest, the fountain of which we all partake, the personal source of grace whom we may be said to possess and to enjoy in common. The divergence between these two interpretations does not in any way affect the doctrine of

¹ 5¹⁶; cp. 3²⁴, 6²³

² 'Moments' in the dialectical or non-temporal meaning of the word. The 'one divine action' is defined in Rom. 3²⁵.

³ For this rendering of Rom. 3^{25a} see C. H. Dodd (M), pp. 54, 55

⁴ 2 Cor. 5^{18, 19}

the Person and work of the Holy Spirit. It is concerned solely with the meaning of the word *koinonia*. In any case the meaning of the phrase must correspond to one or other of the two renderings given above.

There are strong arguments in favour of the former rendering. In the first place this would give the same construction to all three terms in the trinitarian formula of 2 Corinthians 13¹⁴. 'The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ' must mean the grace which comes from Christ, the grace which (as we have already seen) consists in an action or is expressed in a gift coming from him to us. Moreover this is almost certainly the construction also of the second phrase. St. Paul seldom speaks of man's love towards God, whereas he constantly speaks of God's love for man and of man's love for man.¹ 'The grace which Christ bestows upon us, the love which God shows to us and the fellowship which the Holy Spirit imparts' give a parallel meaning to all three terms. Secondly this is supported by a probable meaning of 'the *koinonia*' in Acts 2⁴², the crucial passage from which this investigation began.² For the context of that verse and subsequent chapters depict a new form of fellowship expressed in a distinctive social group. Moreover, although this group already existed in an important sense before the descent of the Spirit as described in Acts 2¹⁻⁴, yet its characteristic features and common way of life, as described in the rest of the Acts, are traced back to that decisive event.³

Thirdly this interpretation of the phrase 'the *koinonia* of the Holy Spirit' is in agreement with that large class of passages in which the distinctive character of the Christian community is ascribed to the indwelling of the Holy Spirit in the Body and in its members, or more generally to an activity of the Spirit.⁴ Finally it can be urged that in Philippians 2¹, the other passage in which the expression '*koinonia* of the Spirit' occurs, 'fellowship imparted by the Spirit' is at least a possible rendering which

¹ For the first of these (man's love towards God) Burton quotes 2 Thess. 3⁵ as 'the only clear example' (ICC, p. 521). It seems to be anything but clear, and should be replaced by Rom. 8²⁸.

² See above, pp. 5ff; cp. also JAR in HDB, art. 'Communion'

³ Note especially the phrase *ἐν ἀρχῇ* (Acts 11¹⁵) which must refer to the event described in 2¹⁻⁴

⁴ e.g. Rom. 5⁵, 8⁹⁻¹⁷, 23-27, 1 Cor. 3^{16, 17}, Gal. 4^{6, 7}, 5¹⁸⁻²⁵, Eph. 4^{3, 4}, 1 Pet. 4¹⁴

fits the context. Moreover there is a certain parallel between the three terms in this text and the three terms in 2 Corinthians 13¹⁴, two of which we have found to correspond with the construction here suggested for the third.¹

There are, however, even stronger reasons for adopting the second meaning of the phrase both in 2 Corinthians 13¹⁴ and in Philippians 2¹, namely, 'participation in the Holy Spirit.' The argument which relies upon the probability of a similar construction in all three terms is inconclusive, since St. Paul is not notable for the smoothness of his style and cannot be tied down by literary rules with such strictness as the argument requires. Moreover all such considerations must give way to the evidence of facts. Now, whereas in the case of the first two terms in 2 Corinthians 13¹⁴ the facts point in one direction, the weight of the evidence suggests an opposite conclusion for the meaning of 'the *koinonia* of the Spirit'. A genitive following the word '*koinonia*' expresses 'habitually' that of which one partakes. The other rendering 'would be grammatical, but contrary to N.T. usage'.² The closest parallel to these two texts about the Spirit is in 1 Corinthians 1⁹, where the exact meaning is 'Ye were called into participation³ in his Son Jesus Christ our Lord'.⁴ It must be noticed, however, that when the object shared is a person 'fellowship with' or 'communion with' may give the meaning as truly as 'participation in'. For such participation may involve a reciprocal relationship of mutual interchanges between spirit and spirit. In purely human relationships it would not necessarily do so. For two slaves might share the same master, or two subjects the same king, under conditions which did not exemplify 'fellowship' or 'communion'. On the other hand in the Pauline usage which we are now considering this word is employed to express a sharing in that unique reciprocal relationship which exists in the Body of Christ between Christians and Christ and again between Christians and the Holy Spirit. Consequently 1 Corinthians 1⁹ can also

¹ For the parallel mentioned above see M. Jones, *The Epistle to the Philippians* (W) 1918, pp. 26, 27. If the parallel with 2 Cor. 13¹⁴ is intentional, it would support the authenticity of the latter text as against Burton's theory of editorial interpolation; see above, p. 67, n. 1.

² Vincent, *Philippians* (ICC), *ad loc.*, p. 54; cp. *ib.*, pp. 6, 7

³ *κοινωνία*

⁴ 'The genitive τοῦ υἱοῦ is objective' (RP, ICC, *ad loc.*, p. 8)

mean: 'Ye were called into fellowship (or communion) with his Son Jesus Christ our Lord'.

The conclusion which has just been reached about the rendering of certain *koinonia* phrases must be regarded as provisional. The exact force of such ideas as 'sharing', 'participation', 'communion', and 'fellowship' in the New Testament requires fuller investigation. We have to return now to the reasons for preferring the second interpretation of the expression 'the *koinonia* of the Holy Spirit', namely, 'the participation in the Holy Spirit.' It will be remembered that the first interpretation was supported by reference to a probable meaning of 'the *koinonia*' in Acts 2⁴² and its context, namely a form of fellowship originated by the Holy Spirit and expressed in a distinctive social group. The recognized translations all employ the word 'fellowship' here, varying only as between 'the fellowship of the apostles' and fellowship realized amongst the members of the Christian community as a whole. This conception of a divinely imparted form of fellowship which set the primitive Church apart and gave to it its special character obviously corresponds in important respects to the facts set forth in the Acts of the Apostles. Moreover it has received corroboration from much that has been said in the first two chapters of this book about the social life of the early Christian community. Nevertheless attention must now be drawn to the possibility that here also the second interpretation is at least as probable as the first.

'The *koinonia*' of Acts 2⁴² is not specifically associated with any one of the other three marks of the primitive community there mentioned. Doubtless it is correct to say that the four terms fall into two pairs, the second pair ('the breaking of bread' and 'the prayers') referring to worship. This however gives no ground for assuming that 'the *koinonia*' here means 'the fellowship of the apostles'. Still less, perhaps, is there justification for ignoring the definite article in three places out of the four where it occurs in this verse.¹ 'The *koinonia*', therefore, must mean either (1) 'the fellowship' or (2) 'the sharing'. As to the first, there is no ground for supposing that it represents a title or name given to the early Christian community, as though the

¹ as is done by M. The commentary based on M simply ignores the problem. See Foakes Jackson *ad loc.*, pp. 20-23.

first Christians were called 'The Fellowship'.¹ On the other hand the primitive 'communism' mentioned a few lines later (v. 44, cp. 4⁸²) may well be in the author's mind, when he uses the term. If so, this connexion of thought would suggest 'the sharing' or 'the having things in common' as the meaning of the phrase. An alternative suggested by one high authority makes the phrase 'almost equivalent to almsgiving'.² As we have seen, this would correspond to a frequent use of the word *koinonia* in the New Testament.³ There is, however, no parallel in the Acts of the Apostles for this particular use of the word. There is one passage where definite reference is made to the 'collection' for the poor at Jerusalem (24¹⁷). If *koinonia* means almsgiving or a charitable contribution in 2⁴² we might expect the same expression where Christian almsgiving is explicitly mentioned. But in 24¹⁷ two other words are used, meaning 'alms' and 'offerings'. The first of these is the usual term for 'alms' in the Acts.⁴

Now if the *koinonia* in 2⁴² means 'the having things in common' with reference to the sharing of possessions, we are faced with a difficulty. For in verse 42 the sharing of possessions has not yet been mentioned, whereas 'the *koinonia*' with the definite article suggests something already familiar to the reader. By the time that Acts was written it could no longer be assumed that the primitive experiment in 'communism' would be familiar to readers without previous explanation. *Koinonia* as a technical name for almsgiving might easily have been familiar in view of its widespread use in this sense in the New Testament. On the other hand, as we have seen, this rendering is here improbable on grounds of vocabulary; and further 'almsgiving' would make an incongruous pair with 'the teaching of the apostles'. What alternatives remain? The *koinonia* must be something as important and characteristic as the other three marks which are singled out for mention. The picture drawn in this part of Acts is of a group of people having certain things in common. Community of material goods was outwardly the most striking evidence of this fact. But it clearly points back to something deeper of which it is a consequence, something which is fundamental to the life of the community. If we call

¹ cp. *Beginnings I*, vol. v, p. 390

² see above, p. 10 and n. 1

³ *Beginnings I*, vol. iv, p. 27

⁴ cp. 3², 9³⁶, 10⁴

this ultimate factor 'fellowship' we are no nearer to an explanation. For fellowship is possible only on the basis of something shared in common. The sharing of possessions expressed an inward unity of those who had 'one heart and soul'. One explanation, and one only, is given in Acts for this unity of spirit, namely the outpouring of the Spirit recorded in 2¹⁻⁴, whose significance is further unfolded in the sermon of St. Peter which follows.¹ What the first Christians had in common was not an inspiring experience, but a gift of the Spirit received and permanently shared. Those who were invited to seek entrance into their fellowship on the basis of repentance and baptism in the name of Jesus Christ were promised a share in the gift. 'Ye shall receive the free gift of the Holy Spirit' (2³⁸). After baptism in the Name, this reception of the Spirit was the hall-mark of a genuine Christian. The author of Acts² is never tired of insisting upon this point. For him the gift of the Spirit was by far the most momentous and characteristic of the things shared in common. How essential he considered the gift to be is shown in Acts 8¹⁴⁻²⁴, where it is recorded that two apostles had to come down to Samaria to bestow the gift upon the new converts there. The gift of the Spirit poured out upon Cornelius and his friends settled decisively the question of their baptism and silenced controversy upon that subject (10⁴⁷, 11¹⁵⁻¹⁸). It was also decisive against John's baptism, to which no such gift was attached (18²⁴⁻¹⁹).³

'The *koinonia*' then was pre-eminently 'the sharing of the Spirit' referred to in 2 Corinthians 13¹⁴ and in Philippians 2¹. If this interpretation be adopted, however, it must not be understood in a sense which excludes the other alternative. The two interpretations emphasize two aspects of a complex whole which includes them both. We may, therefore, readily agree with the view that the word *koinonia* by itself means 'a relation between individuals which involves common and mutual interest and participation in a common object'.⁴ Treated in abstraction, the word could not be more adequately defined. None the less every concrete instance of *koinonia*, so understood, does in fact draw its whole significance from the

¹ especially in v. 33

² or his source

³ cp. 11¹⁸

⁴ Vincent, *Philippians* (ICC), pp. 6, 7

character of the 'common object' in which men so participate.¹ This must be regarded as a universal truth about the social life of man. We have, in this book, already found it to have a peculiar significance in the descriptions of the Christian *koinonia* which occur in the New Testament.² *Koinonia* and kindred words are frequently used to indicate some subordinate, or at least purely practical activity, in which the common life of Christians is expressed or exemplified. The range of significance attaching to this group of words can be discovered only by reference to the context; but frequently it is determined by the genitive of the object shared. Two such genitives of the object shared stand out above all others. The fundamental definitions of the *koinonia* are those which describe our participation in Jesus Christ and in the Holy Spirit.³

It seems possible that we have here a clue to the use of the word in Acts 2⁴². With the article, but without a qualifying genitive, 'the *koinonia*' is set down as the second characteristic mark of the primitive Church, to which the first disciples gave their steadfast adherence. The essence of the *koinonia* was a life shared in common. In Acts it is described by reference to a gift of the Spirit outpoured and received. The common object was the gift of the Holy Spirit as imparted to the disciples. Its impartation is twice described as an outpouring, namely on the occasion of its first bestowal (2³³) and again on the unique occasion when, by a second Pentecost, the Gentiles received the gift before baptism (10⁴⁴⁻⁴⁸).⁴ The author of Acts would have agreed that 'the *koinonia*' to which he refers in 2⁴² is not to be distinguished from 'the *koinonia* of the Spirit' of which St. Paul wrote in 2 Corinthians 13¹⁴ and Philippians 2¹. For that is the aspect of the *koinonia* which is particularly emphasized in his book. He prefers, however, to refer to it without qualification in a statement which has every appearance of studied exactitude. May not the true explanation of this language be that the author knew the

¹ see especially L. W. Grensted, *Psychology and God*, ch. 1, and the authorities there cited

² see especially p. 47 above

³ 1 Cor. 1⁹, 2 Cor. 13¹⁴, Phil. 2¹, Heb. 3¹⁴, 6⁴

⁴ ἐκκέχυται . . . in v. 45 is to be compared with ἐξέχεεν . . . in 2³³. See also, on this phraseology, W. K. Lowther Clarke in *Confirmation* (SPCK), vol. i, p. 18. But see further below, pp. 82-105.

koinonia as a many-sided reality and that he expected his readers also to be aware of this fact?

We know from the epistles that the *koinonia* language covers a great variety of ideas. Yet all of these various ideas can be seen to be closely interrelated in the well-defined pattern of the common life, as that life was shared in fellowship. That life transcended the community because in essence it was a communion with Christ and with the Holy Spirit. On the divine side it was a mystical union with and participation in the life of Christ through receiving the gift of the Spirit. On the human side it consisted in a fellowship of brethren, whose mutual relations were transformed in quality and significance through the gift which they shared. All the characteristic activities of this fellowship are manifestations of these two fundamental factors, of this one complex yet simple whole with *its two fundamental aspects, the divine and the human*. Such was the *koinonia* to which the first Christians 'devoted themselves'.¹

Returning then to the meaning of the phrase in 2 Corinthians 13¹⁴ we conclude that it has that comprehensive meaning which has just been assigned to it in the last paragraph. Only the addition of the genitive ('of the Holy Spirit') lays the whole emphasis upon that aspect of the *koinonia* which is referred to the gift of the Spirit and to the characteristic activity of the Spirit as described elsewhere by St. Paul. The *koinonia* is ultimately one reality with many aspects. Yet all of these aspects can be traced back to a common life or a life shared in common. When we ask what is the source of this life in which we share, two answers are given in the New Testament. The life shared is referred for its source to Jesus Christ and to the Holy Spirit. The significance of the *koinonia*, therefore, can be stated in *two ways* according as we refer it either to the first or to the second of these two divine sources. Accordingly, in the last chapter attention was concentrated upon the first way, that which refers the *koinonia* in its manifoldness to Christ. In turning to the second way of stating the doctrine we shall expect to find that the two ways are closely interrelated. We have therefore reached a stage of this exposition, where we have to take account, not only of the meaning to be assigned to the phrase: 'the *koinonia* of the Spirit', but also of the relation between the three terms

¹ Acts 2⁴² (M)

in 2 Corinthians 13¹⁴. This was the second of the three questions set down at the beginning of the present chapter.¹ In considering the third of these questions (why are the terms placed in this order?) we found that we could not rest content with the *prima facie* literary explanations offered, because they merely drew attention to a fact of the highest doctrinal significance, namely the predominance assigned to the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ in the apostolic writings. The importance of this fact rendered necessary at that stage a brief examination of the relation between the first two terms in the text, namely the grace of Christ and the love of God. We have now to return to that part of the subject by bringing the first two terms into relation with the *koinonia* of the Spirit.

We begin by noticing that there is a certain parallel to be observed between the *two ways* of stating the significance of the *koinonia*.² Not only are they interrelated; they are also parallel in the sense that, from whichever of these two sides we regard the *koinonia*, we always find confronting us the two fundamental aspects referred to in the last paragraph but one.³ In either case we are concerned not simply with a human fellowship and its characteristic embodiments, but also with the divine life imparted to that fellowship, without which the fellowship in its distinctively Christian character would cease to exist. In the case of our participation in Christ this twofoldness of the *koinonia* is admirably brought out in a well-known commentary. In their paraphrase of 1 Corinthians 1⁹ Robertson and Plummer render the text thus:⁴ 'God . . . who himself called you into fellowship⁵ with his Son and in his Son, Jesus Christ our Lord.' Here, whilst the genitive is correctly taken as objective,⁶ neither aspect of the *koinonia* is ignored.⁷ The fellowship is with Jesus Christ; that is to say, its primary object is a sharing of Christ's life by his people. But it is also 'in Christ', because it is a fellowship of Christians with one another, and a Christian is a person who is in Christ (2 Cor. 5¹⁷, Gal. 3²⁸). This twofoldness of the *koinonia* appears again, when we refer it to the Holy Spirit. For,

¹ above, p. 66

² i.e. in relation (i) to Christ, and (ii) to the Spirit

³ i.e. the divine and the human aspects respectively; see above, p. 76

⁴ RP (ICC), p. 4

⁵ κοινωνίαν

⁶ *ibid.*, p. 8

⁷ subject to the proviso above on p. 72

whereas it is fundamentally a participation in the Holy Spirit as the gift shared, it is also a fellowship whose unity is 'the unity of the Spirit' (Eph. 4³). Everything which is properly characteristic of the Christian fellowship is due to the indwelling presence and activity of the Holy Spirit. The connexion between these two aspects of 'the *koinonia* of the Spirit' is simply this, that the indwelling presence and activity of the Spirit are the result of the gift poured out and received, imparted and shared.¹

Besides this general parallelism of structure between the two ways of regarding the *koinonia*, according as it is referred to Christ and to the Spirit there is another kind of parallelism, which will have to be considered later.² We must now resume the subject of the relations between all the three terms in 2 Corinthians 13¹⁴. The fullest explication of this text is to be found in Romans 5¹⁻¹¹, which might almost have been written as a commentary upon it. This passage in Romans is also the fullest statement about justification in the Pauline epistles. Moreover it is closely connected with the shorter statement upon the same subject which occurs in 3²³⁻²⁶. Chapter 4, notwithstanding its momentous conclusion, is an interlude explaining the connexion of justification with 'faith' in contrast to 'works' of the law.³ In Romans 5¹⁻¹¹ the meaning of justification is unfolded in such a way that we see it in its whole theological context. It is here connected with Christ's action in dying for us, with the love of God and with the gift of the Spirit, as well as with the notions of grace, reconciliation and salvation.

The opening verses of Romans 5 are rendered best in Dr. Moffatt's translation:

As we are justified by faith, then, let us enjoy the peace we have with God through our Lord Jesus Christ. Through him we have got access⁴ to this grace where we have our standing, and triumph in the hope of God's glory. (vv. 1, 2)

In this statement, which includes exhortation,⁵ we are told that through the gracious action of Christ in his death and resurrection (4²⁵) our status before God has been transformed. We are

¹ see the references noted above on pp. 70-75

² see below, pp. 137-142

³ The connexion between Rom. 4 and 5 is examined in Chapter IX; see below, pp. 273-279

⁴ omitting *τῇ πίστει* (M margin)

⁵ *ἐχόμεν* in v. 1

no longer like criminals standing before a judge and awaiting sentence of condemnation. For we have been declared 'not guilty'. We are no longer prisoners at the bar, liable to punishment for our sins. Our fetters have been struck off, and we are free men. But even that is not the whole story. For, like Joseph, we have exchanged the prison-house for the royal court. We have been introduced by our mediator into the presence-chamber of the heavenly king.¹ We are, indeed, more than favoured courtiers; we are worshippers admitted to the sanctuary. We have our standing in the sacred enclosure of the temple courts, where the divine favour shines upon us like the warming rays of the sun. In this state of grace we are no longer estranged by sin. For we have been reconciled to God (cp. v. 10). We are at peace with him through his forgiveness, and we can enjoy that peace if we will. In the words of another epistle, we all are fellow-partakers of the grace.² Having access to the innermost shrine, where the radiance of the Shekinah overshadows the mercy-seat, we are no longer cut off by our sins from the glory of God.³ Hereafter we shall be wholly transfigured by that glory. According to the teaching of another epistle that process of transfiguration has already begun.⁴ One day it will be completed; and since we are already admitted to the Presence we look forward to that consummation with exultant hope.

Here, as in 8¹⁷⁻²⁵, St. Paul speaks of the divine glory as the object of our hope. 'We shall be glorified with' Christ hereafter, and the pledge of this promised transformation lies in the fact that we now share Christ's sufferings (8¹⁷). We are partakers in the messianic life, and suffering is followed by glory in the pattern of that life.⁵ Accordingly we exult, not only in hope of the glory, but also in the troubles which we now undergo and which are its necessary prelude. As another writer reminds us, even our Lord 'although he was Son, learned obedience from the things which he suffered'.⁶ So we too accept trouble joyfully because it 'produces endurance', which in turn 'produces character, and character produces hope'.⁷ Thus the hope of the glory, the hope which characterizes the new state of grace, is actually increased and strengthened by troubles which might be

¹ *Ὁ τὴν προσαγωγὴν* (v. 2) see SH, *ad loc.*, p. 121; cp. Eph. 2¹⁸

² Phil. 1⁷

³ Rom. 3²³

⁴ 2 Cor. 3¹⁸

⁵ see above, pp. 37, 38

⁶ Heb. 5⁸

⁷ Rom. 5^{3,4} (M)

expected to daunt us. Christian hope, however, cannot be disappointed 'since God's love floods our hearts through the Holy Spirit which has been given to us'.¹

Verse 5 provides the key to the whole of the preceding description of the justified state and links it on to what follows. It also introduces the second and third terms of 2 Corinthians 13¹⁴. Before we examine this verse, however, something further must be said about the passage as a whole. The main sequence of thought is as follows: (i) Verses 1-4 describe the immediate consequences of justification and the state of justified sinners as seen from their point of view. (ii) The interior ground of this state is then set forth in verse 5 with its description of the entry of God's love into our hearts through the gift of the Spirit. (iii) The writer then turns to the objective ground of justification in history, namely the death of Christ on behalf of the ungodly (v. 6). In the connexion between verses 5 and 6 there is implied a close relation between Christ's death and the love of God. (iv) This is now explained. The death of Christ provides an objective assurance of God's love (vv. 7, 8). (v) Finally God's love in Christ, made manifest in the events through which our justification was effected, assures us also of our future salvation (vv. 9-11). The whole passage, therefore, has two main aspects, according as we consider the historical ground of justification in the death of Christ, or the resultant state of the sinner attributed in verse 5 to the gift of the Spirit. It must also be noticed that the love of God is related to both of these aspects and connects them together. For this reason, if for no other, Romans 5¹⁻¹¹ provides a brilliant commentary upon 2 Corinthians 13¹⁴. For there the love of God is set between the grace of Christ and the *koinonia* of the Spirit, whilst here, in Romans, it is connected first with the gift of the Spirit and then with the death of Christ.

It would not, however, be true to say that the order of 2 Corinthians is reversed. For Romans 5¹⁻⁵ takes us through that order precisely. Only verses 6-11 return from the connexion of God's love with the gift of the Spirit to the connexion of that love with Christ's death and resurrection. It must further be said that verses 1-5, whilst following the order of 2 Corinthians 13¹⁴, are concerned with the state of justification as

¹ v. 5 (M); for a criticism of this translation see below, pp. 82 ff

inwardly apprehended and appreciated by its recipients, namely justified sinners. That section begins with the state of peace with God which justified sinners may enjoy. Our Lord is introduced as the agent through whom we are brought into the new condition. Grace is here not his act upon the Cross nor his free gift, but the divine favour, regarded as a place of sanctuary to which he has brought us; although clearly our transformed condition is the result of his act and gift. The interior condition of justified sinners is then traced to a double event in their hearts, the entry of God's love through the gift of the Spirit. Thus the subjective reference of 2 Corinthians 13¹⁴ is worked out point by point. By the 'subjective reference' is meant simply the relation of the three terms in 2 Corinthians 13¹⁴ to the inward state of justified sinners, regarded as subjects of that state and recipients of its characteristic privileges. The objective reference of the same text would refer to the objective content and significance of its three terms regarded as expressions through which there is conveyed to us a revelation of God. The order of 2 Corinthians is observed. For here we pass from Christ's agency in bringing us to the new state to that state itself regarded as an enjoyment of God's favour and love. This in turn is traced to the gift of the Spirit. It is also to be noticed that our relation to the love of God is described from two points of view in verses 1-5. First we are restored to the favour of his presence by the mediation of Christ. Then an event still more intimate in character is described as having taken place, namely, an inflow of his love into our hearts through our participation in the Spirit.

The text of verse 5, as rendered in the Revised Version, runs as follows:

And hope putteth not to shame; because the love of God hath been shed abroad¹ in our hearts through the Holy Ghost which was given² to us.

The description of the state of justification and its consequences concludes with a picture of Christian character developing under trial and coming triumphantly through the test. Particular emphasis is laid upon the virtues of hope and fortitude, or endurance, through which character is purified or hardened

¹ ἐκκέχυται

² τοῦ δοθέντος

in the furnace of experience.¹ The hidden source of this astonishing strength is then disclosed. The metaphor of testing is exchanged for that of refreshment. Hope does not wither, because it is watered with nothing less than the love of God. Unlike the seed which fell upon rocky ground this plant can withstand 'the scorching wind' of temptation and adversity.² For St. Paul justified souls are like the man of whom we read that 'he shall be like a tree planted by the streams of water, that bringeth forth its fruit in its season, whose leaf also doth not wither'.³ A similar picture is drawn by Jeremiah of 'the man that trusteth in the Lord. . . . He shall be as a tree planted by the waters.' A few lines later this language is explained when God is referred to as 'the Lord, the fountain of living waters'.⁴

This conception of God as the fountain-source of life and spiritual refreshment is connected in Romans 5⁵ with the gift of the Spirit. In view of this connexion the precise language used is highly significant. Unfortunately the recognized English translations have taken extraordinary liberties with this important verse. The Authorized Version renders it: 'The love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us.' The tenses of both verbs are ignored; and the rendering 'shed abroad' quite obscures the plain meaning of the Greek word used, concealing its literary associations, which are vital to the significance of the text. The Revised Version gives the tenses correctly, but retains 'shed abroad', sacrificing accuracy to a picturesque phrase. Dr. Moffatt's version obliterates both tenses again. It also introduces a new picturesque phrase, which, if anything, obscures still further the true meaning of the passage. An exact translation would be: 'The love of God *has been poured out* in our hearts through the Holy Spirit which *was given* unto us.'⁵ Dr. Moffatt's phrase: 'floods our hearts' is attractive, and points to an important truth.⁶ The idea which it suggests is, however, not the fundamental idea indicated by St. Paul's language in this text.

We speak of a person going into 'floods of tears' with literal truth. The physical fact usually indicates an accompanying

¹ cp. 1 Pet. 1⁷, Jas. 1³

² Mark 4^{5, 6}; cp. Jas. 1¹¹

³ Ps. 1³

⁴ Jer. 17^{7, 8, 13}; cp. 2¹³

⁵ italics mine

⁶ SH had already adopted the phrase in their commentary, first published in 1895

'flood' of emotion, or (as we sometimes say) an emotional 'storm'. This metaphorical conception of an emotional flood is further illustrated, when in another mood we say that our hearts are 'flooded with joy'. This is a vivid picture of an emotional state. Accordingly, when Dr. Moffatt wrote: 'God's love floods our hearts' it is natural to suppose that this choice of language was intended to suggest an emotional experience. In such an experience we become emotionally convinced that God's love is a living reality acting upon us and in us. That such experiences occur, and that they have a highly important place in the Christian life, there can be no doubt. It is not, however, of such facts that St. Paul is speaking in Romans 5⁵. The language here adopted by Dr. Moffatt seems to indicate a not uncommon mistake—the mistake of translating an objective truth into its subjective counterpart.

In Sanday and Headlam's paraphrase of this verse the mistake is quite explicit: 'That Holy Spirit which we received when we became Christians floods our hearts with the consciousness of the love of God for us.'¹ The first half of this rendering brings out admirably the meaning of 'the Holy Spirit which was given unto us'. But the second half is deplorable. For first it describes, or at least suggests, floods of emotion about which St. Paul says nothing. Worse still, where the apostle writes about the love of God, his interpreters substitute our 'consciousness of the love of God'. What a difference! The apostle must have been well aware of the prophetic teaching that the true God is 'the fountain of living waters'; so he gives a beautiful picture of God's love being poured out in our hearts like a refreshing shower upon dry ground. This picture emphasizes the 'givenness' of God's love as it descends upon us and enters our hearts. The whole of this emphasis is missed in the paraphrase. Our minds are turned instead to our own 'consciousness',² to the psychological state of those who receive the gift. Finally we are told quite plainly that *agape* thus comes to mean 'our sense of God's love.'³ With a view to illustrating further this strange method of exegesis they go on to explain that *eirene* (in verse 1) is equal to 'our sense of peace with God.' So Dr. Moffatt's excellent

¹ SH⁵, pp. 118, 119

² The commentary was written in pre-Freudian days

³ italics by SH

translation of that verse: 'let us enjoy the peace we have with God' should read: 'let us enjoy our sense of peace with God'. This might fairly be called 'looking-glass' theology. Everything is converted into its psychological counterpart. This juggling feat receives no sanction from psychology.¹ At no level of experience is it true that the object has simple psychological identity with the sensations, feelings, awareness or consciousness which are generated, aroused or occasioned by that object. To say that 'the love of God' in Romans 5⁵ is equivalent to our 'consciousness of the love of God' is to fall into this psychological error. But that is the least important criticism to be made about such a statement. It also substitutes religious experience for the object of that experience, namely God. This is perhaps the most dangerous of all religious cults. It is indeed a form of idolatry. For it substitutes the ever-changing conditions, limited horizons and finite activities of our minds for the One Reality which we should adore. This is to put our trust in ourselves rather than in God.

¹ Anyone who doubts this statement should read that impressive book *The Foundations of Character* by Alexander Shand. The author shows with a wealth of illustration from literature that the whole of our mental life is organized round *objects*. The units of mental life so formed are called *sentiments*. The essence of a sentiment is that it is not self-dependent, but has its being through attachment to the object. The object is a nucleus round which the sentiment is organized. *Interest* is generated by the object and receives organized expression in the sentiment. This is possible precisely because the object is 'other' than the mental life, standing over against it in transcendence, though also penetrating it.

For further illustrations of the error in question, as it appears in New Testament exegesis, see the following:

(1) Plummer on 2 *Corinthians* (ICC), p. 384: 'the sense of membership which the Holy Spirit imparts to those who are united in one Body.' This is given as a paraphrase of ἡ κοινωνία τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος in 2 Cor. 13¹⁴.

(2) Commenting on the same passage in his article *Communion* in HDB, vol. i, p. 460², JAR referred to 'the true sense of membership which the One Spirit gives to the One Body' and which is prayed for in the words 'the fellowship of the Holy Spirit.' After a reference to the κοινωνία passage in Phil. 2¹, he concludes: 'It is most natural to interpret the phrase in both places of the sense of unity, membership or fellowship, which it is the peculiar work of the Holy Spirit to preserve in the Christian Church.' It will be noticed that both writers decide for a subjective genitive in 2 Cor. 13¹⁴, on which see above, pp. 69-75. On the psychological issue see further Grensted, *Psychology and God*, ch. 1.

We must assume, then, that St. Paul meant what he said. The love of God has been poured out in our hearts like streams of water upon dry ground.¹ The meaning of this profound metaphor depends upon the significance of the verb *ekkechutai*. We may find a clue in the story of Cornelius in Acts 10^{44, 45}. We are told that, as St. Peter was concluding his address to the assembled company, the Holy Spirit 'fell upon all those who were hearing the word' (v. 44). 'And they of the circumcision which believed were amazed, as many as came with Peter, because that on the Gentiles also was poured out (*ekkechutai*) the gift of the Holy Ghost' (v. 45). For the author of Acts the event so described was the beginning of a new epoch in human history. Upon Gentiles, uncircumcised and unbaptized, the Spirit was poured out. This was an act of God to which there was no parallel save the original outpouring of the Spirit on the Day of Pentecost. It was in fact a second Pentecost, which by special divine intervention made clear the universal scope of Christian salvation. To mark this fact the author used a word which was, in his mind, associated with that original outpouring as described in Acts 2. In his account of that event this word occurs three times. All three instances occur in St. Peter's sermon. The first two are in his opening quotation from the prophecy of Joel:² 'I will pour forth³ of my Spirit upon all flesh. . . . On my servants and on my handmaidens in those days will I pour forth³ of my Spirit' (2^{17, 18}). The third instance comes near the end of the sermon. After summarizing the gospel story with special attention to the fact of our Lord's resurrection, the preacher continues with a reference to the ascension and its present sequel: 'Being therefore by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he poured forth⁴ this, which ye see and hear' (2³³). The prophecy of Joel was fulfilled, when the ascended Messiah poured forth the Spirit.

In Joel the speaker who promises to pour out his Spirit is 'the Lord your God' (2²⁷). In Acts the action by which this promise

¹ cp. Isa. 44³ on which see below, pp. 89, 90

² Joel 2²⁸⁻³² taken with slight variations from the LXX. On the variations (which do not affect the present argument) see *Beginnings I*, vol. iv, *ad loc.*, pp. 21, 22.

³ ἐκχεῶ

⁴ ἐξέχεεν. RV here turns the aorist into a perfect.

is fulfilled is performed by the ascended Jesus. He was qualified to fill this rôle by the fact that he had 'received the promise of the Holy Spirit from the Father'. Doubtless Dr. Moffatt is correct in rendering this phrase 'receiving from the Father the long-promised holy Spirit' (2³³). Our Lord had at his baptism received the fulness of the Spirit for his messianic mission.¹ He was also designated by the Baptist as One who shall baptize with the Holy Spirit.² This also was in accordance with prophecy: 'I will sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean; from all your filthiness, and from all your idols, will I cleanse you. A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you . . . and I will put my spirit within you.'³ The Baptist announced the Agent through whom these words would be fulfilled. In Luke-Acts the risen Christ identifies himself with this rôle: 'Behold, I send forth the promise of my Father upon you.'⁴ He then was the author of the pentecostal outpouring. In the passage which follows St. Peter's sermon we are left in no doubt as to how 'the promise' is to be implemented after Pentecost:

Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto remission of your sins; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. For to you is the promise, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call unto him. (Acts 2^{38, 39})

Repentance and baptism in the Name unto remission of sins: these are the conditions for the reception of the gift of the Spirit. In this way the promised outpouring will be granted not only to its first recipients, but to many more, a great company of the elect. All this is accurately summarized at the close of the first Christian epoch in familiar words:

When the kindness of God our Saviour, and his love toward man, appeared, not by works done in righteousness, which we did ourselves, but according to his mercy he saved us, through the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost, which he poured out⁵ upon us richly, through Jesus Christ our Saviour; that being justified by his grace, we might be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life. (Titus 3⁴⁻⁷)

¹ Isa 11², Mark 1¹⁰ and parallels

² Ezek. 36²⁵⁻²⁷

³ ἐξέχεεν

⁴ Mark 1⁸ and parallels

⁵ Luke 24⁴⁹; cp. Acts 1^{4, 5}

Here once more the pentecostal note is struck by the introduction of Joel's word *ekcheo*. The outpouring of the Spirit has been made available for all, and is associated on the one hand with baptism and on the other hand with justification 'by his grace'.¹ This passage, in fact, contains a careful summary of New Testament teaching about Christian salvation. Most of the points included are to be found in Romans 5¹⁻¹¹. But whereas that is primarily a statement about justification, this is a more formal theological summary of Christian soteriology. Its teaching is Pauline in substance; but some of the phraseology is not at all characteristic of St. Paul. Here as in Acts 2³⁸ Jesus Christ is the agent through whom the Spirit is outpoured. But it is 'God our Saviour' who poured out upon us the gift 'through Jesus Christ our Saviour'. Again this passage agrees with Acts 2 in asserting that baptism is an appointed condition for receiving the gift of the Spirit, although the form in which this truth is stated is decidedly more developed. The teaching about justification is substantially Pauline, particularly the emphatic statement that we are not saved by works. Justification 'by his grace' is here connected with salvation and the hope of glory (eternal life) much as in Romans 5. It is also connected with baptism and with the gift of the Spirit. Both of these points are Pauline, although 'the washing of regeneration' is not.² Romans 5⁵ teaches that the 'gift of the Spirit' is an operative cause of the state of the justified as described in verses 1-4. In 1 Corinthians 6¹¹ the moment of justification is identified with the moment of baptism.

To this passage we turn next. It runs as follows:

And such were some of you: but ye washed yourselves,³ but ye were sanctified, but ye were justified in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, and in the Spirit of our God.

'The repetitions of the aorist' show that all three verbs refer to the same event.⁴ It might be added that two of the aorists in question are inserted *between* the 'washing' of baptism and the two phrases which elsewhere in the New Testament define the

¹ cp. Rom. 3²⁴

² i.e. the words: *λουτροῦ παλιγγενεσίας*. But the idea has its roots in Pauline teaching about the new creation.

³ RV margin

⁴ RP (ICC), p. 119

significance of baptism, that is to say, 'the name of the Lord Jesus Christ' and 'the Spirit of our God'.¹ Baptism in the Name and in the Spirit is here identified with justification in the Name and in the Spirit. The connexion of thought is well brought out in the paraphrase adopted by the same writers: 'Of such vile sort some of you once were. But you washed your pollutions away, you were made holy, you were made righteous, by sharing in the Name of our Lord Jesus Christ and in the gift of the Spirit of our God.'²

This stage of our investigation into the meaning of Romans 5⁵ is now within sight of its conclusion. It will be convenient to summarize the argument so far developed: (i) The word which should be translated 'has been poured out' in this verse comes from Joel's prophecy about the outpouring of the Spirit. (ii) According to Acts the first Christians found the fulfilment of this prophecy in the events of the first Whitsunday. (iii) St. Paul gives to this word a new application by substituting for the outpouring of the Spirit an outpouring of God's love through the gift of the Spirit. (iv) This double event, described in language with pentecostal associations, is for the apostle an operative cause to which justification and its consequences are attributed. (v) In an earlier epistle the same writer clearly identifies the divine act of justification with the sacramental event of baptism. (vi) In 1 Corinthians 6¹¹ the many-sided event which is outwardly baptism and inwardly justification is described in a series of aorists; in Romans 5⁵ the gift of the Spirit is assigned to a definite moment in the past by the use of the same tense.³ (vii) We conclude therefore that the tense of the final verb in Romans 5⁵ ('which was given to us') is a 'baptismal' aorist like those in 1 Corinthians 6¹¹. The double event described in Romans 5⁵ took place at baptism, or at least had its inception there.

This conclusion, however, requires fuller explanation. We have still a number of questions to clear up, most of all the meaning of the central phrase about the outpouring of God's love in our hearts. Meanwhile, if the present line of argument is sound, St. Paul associated with the crisis of baptism that transformation of the sinner's relations with God which is

¹ cp Acts 2³⁸

² RP, p. 117; cp. also M *ad loc.*

³ τοῦ δοθέντος ἡμῖν

called justification. That great transformation was then and there effected through the Holy Spirit bestowed upon the neophyte. In this passage the sequence of thought in verses 4 and 5 shows that the whole of the new Christian status is regarded as having been effected by the agency of the Spirit. This is also the most probable meaning of the language used about the Spirit in 1 Corinthians 6¹¹ and 12^{13,1}. The activity of the Spirit by which justification is effected is also said to be the result of a divine gift. The Spirit is given by God. In what sense the Spirit is so given in baptism is a very large question upon which we cannot here enter.² But in the present passage it seems clear that the gift contemplated is not a supplement to baptism, since it is the cause of justification. This is not always the language of the New Testament (cp. Acts 2³⁸); but then there may be more than one gift of the Spirit offered for our reception in the process of Christian initiation, and again in the course of the Christian life.

We return now to the pentecostal outpouring of God's love in our hearts. St. Peter after his pentecostal sermon assured the listening crowds that through baptism they might 'receive the gift of the Holy Spirit' and so have a share in the Promise, that is, the promised gift of the Spirit which had just been outpoured.³ In Romans 5⁵ the outpouring is vouchsafed through the gift of the Spirit in baptism. It is exactly the same line of thought. Through baptism we are made partakers in the original outpouring at Pentecost. How, then, did St. Paul come to speak of this outpouring in terms not of the Spirit, but of the love of God? Part of the answer to this question seems to lie in the Old Testament, where the sources of men's refreshment, material and spiritual, are spoken of in two ways. The two ways of speaking are illustrated, on the one hand by Jeremiah's 'fountain of living waters' (Jer. 2¹³, 17¹³), and on the other hand by Joel's prophecy of an outpoured Spirit. The two ways of speaking are blended in Isaiah 44^{3,4}: 'I will pour water upon him that is

¹ The preposition *ἐν*, in 1 Cor. 12¹³, is best rendered 'by' rather than 'in'; so *M ad loc.* 1 Cor. 6¹¹ is not so clear. But the 'causal and basal sense' of *ἐν* fits both phrases there also. See Burton, *Galatians* (ICC), p. 124.

² See Mason, *The relation of Confirmation to Baptism*; and *Confirmation* (SPCK, ed. Lowther Clarke), vol. i.

³ Acts 2^{38, 39} and see p. 86 above

thirsty,¹ and streams upon the dry ground: I will pour my spirit upon thy seed, and my blessing upon thine offspring: and they shall spring up among the grass, as willows by the water-courses.' Here the Spirit of God is apparently identified with a celestial water-supply, which can be poured out in showers for the refreshment of Israel's seed. Joel's outpouring of the Spirit, therefore, comes from Jeremiah's fountain of living waters. But in Hebrew the words for 'spirit' mean 'breath', as in other languages. So it is not surprising that the metaphor of refreshment by showers from above is not always stated in terms of 'the Spirit'. Thus in Isaiah 32 and 33 the two ways of speaking are in contrast. Isaiah 32¹⁵ has: 'until the spirit be poured upon us from on high and the wilderness become a fruitful field and the fruitful field be counted for a forest.' The verses which follow are full of significance for our understanding of Romans 5¹⁻⁵. The outpouring of the Spirit brings judgement, righteousness and peace to earth. 'The work of righteousness shall be peace; and the effect of righteousness quietness and confidence for ever. And my people shall dwell in a peaceable habitation, and in sure dwellings and in quiet resting-places' (Isa. 32¹⁸⁻¹⁸). It is not surprising then that St. Paul attributes our entry into the new righteousness, into the secure refuge of God's favour, into enjoyment of peace with God and confident hope of glory, to a pentecostal outpouring which comes through the gift of the Spirit. Similarly the opening words of Romans 5⁵: 'Hope putteth not to shame; because the love of God hath been poured out', etc., follow a connexion of thought which is parallel to that in Joel (2^{27, 28}): 'My people shall never be ashamed. And it shall come to pass afterward, that I will pour out my Spirit.'

But now contrast this outpouring of the Spirit with Isaiah 33^{20, 21}: 'Look upon Zion, the city of our solemnities; thine eyes shall see Jerusalem a quiet habitation. . . . But there the Lord shall be with us in majesty, a place of broad rivers and streams.' A similar passage occurs in Psalm 46^{4, 5}: 'There is a river, the streams whereof make glad the city of God, the holy place of the tabernacles of the Most High. God is in the midst of her; she shall not be moved.' Of this picture we are told that 'the poet had in mind the watercourses built by Hezekiah, bringing water from Wady Urtas to Jerusalem, and distributing it into

¹ 'the thirsty land' (RV margin)

several brooks and ponds'.¹ We hear of this 'river of God' again in Psalm 65⁹: 'Thou visitest the earth, thou greatly enrichest it; the river of God is full of water.' Showers of rain flow down from a celestial river and water the land (vv. 9-13). Once more in Psalm 36^{8,9}: 'They shall be watered² with the fatness of thy house; and thou shalt make them drink of the river of thy pleasures. For with thee is the fountain of life.' 'The sources of rain are here conceived in a superterrestrial brook or river.'³ We are referred to Genesis 1⁷: 'the waters which were above the firmament', for the origin of this conception. On the other hand, as we have seen, the outpoured celestial waters reappear as a river of God on earth. It waters the garden of Eden (Gen. 2¹⁰) as well as the holy city and the holy land. In the new Jerusalem of prophetic vision it is to flow forth from under the threshold of the temple, creating a new earthly paradise.⁴ The river of God in the Apocalypse proceeds 'out of the throne of God and of the Lamb' (22^{1,2}).

For St. Paul then, those who were, by their Christian initiation, made partakers of the gift of the Spirit have access to the river of divine love which flows from a celestial source, that is, from the very fount of deity. That stream of love has been poured out in their hearts because they have been made partakers of the Spirit which God through the ascended Messiah poured out upon the messianic community. The precise relation of the outpoured love to the gift of the Spirit is a subject for further inquiry. For the present we must turn to another aspect of the passage which we are considering. The *koinonia* of the Spirit is a common sharing of the many in the one gift of the Spirit, just as the *koinonia* of Christ is a common sharing of the many in the one messianic life, death and resurrection. So the description of the justified state in Romans 5¹⁻¹¹ has both an individual and a corporate aspect. The initiation of the Christian neophyte is highly personal. Justification, forgiveness of sins, the gift of the Spirit, all of these correspond to and presuppose individual repentance and faith. Problems have arisen about the relation of the gifts and the response to one another. But all Christians agree as to the necessity of both and as to the

¹ Briggs, *Psalms* (ICC) *ad loc.*, vol. i, p. 395

² RV margin

³ Briggs, on Ps. 65; *op. cit.*, vol. ii, p. 83

⁴ Ezek. 47¹⁻¹²; cp. Joel 3¹⁸, Zech. 14⁸

highly personal significance of Christian initiation. Yet it is equally true that there is a large measure of agreement about the social aspect of our entrance into the Christian life. We are received into the community of Christ's people, that community which traces its spiritual ancestry back continuously to the Upper Room in Jerusalem; that community which corporately received the outpouring of the Spirit.

This community was always present to the mind of St. Paul as he wrote his epistles. He was doubtless thinking of it when he wrote Romans 5¹⁻¹¹. The evidence of this is to be seen in his use of plurals throughout the passage. Never once does he drop into the singular number throughout these eleven verses. He is thinking throughout of the Many in the One Community here as surely as in 1 Corinthians 12, where he describes the One Body. So there is no disjunction of thought when he passes on in 5¹² to the contrast between the fallen community of Adam and the new organism of the Many baptized into the One Man, Christ Jesus. The question has been asked: 'Is the society or the individual the proper object of justification?' The reply given is the only one possible: 'The Christian sacrifice with its effects . . . reach the individual through the community.'¹ This would certainly have been the considered reply of St. Paul, though of course he understood the community in no narrow sense. Christianity means *koinonia*, a common life. We are admitted with all who are justified to a share in common privileges. What is common to all must be shared. What is shared cannot be had in isolation. This is the truth summarized in the familiar words: *Extra ecclesiam nulla salus*. But the essence of the *ecclesia* is a mutual sharing in the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, the love of God and the gift of the Holy Spirit. So if each individual entered into the common life when the gift of the Spirit was imparted to him, and if he was not justified apart from faith, yet also his justification was an entry into 'this grace' in which we all together have our standing, where all enjoy the peace which we together have in God. He entered the community of the Upper Room where 'the love of God has been poured out in our hearts'; in the hearts of all,—because all have a share in the one outpouring of the Spirit which took place once for all in history at the feast of Pentecost.

¹ SH, Additional Note on Rom. 5¹. ² (*op. cit.*, pp. 122-124)

Some further light upon the meaning of Romans 5⁵ may be obtained from 1 Corinthians 12¹³, which reads as follows:

For in one Spirit were we all baptized into one body, whether Jews or Greeks, whether bond or free; and were all made to drink of one Spirit.

'In one Spirit' suggests that to be dipped in the baptismal water is to be dipped in the Spirit. As we have seen, the Spirit is commonly likened to water in the Bible and this image is actually used in the last clause of the present verse. On the other hand the personal agency of the Spirit is strongly emphasized in the preceding passage (vv. 4-11). This is clear on two grounds: (1) first because the passage as a whole is trinitarian and by analogy suggests personal activity in each case; (2) secondly because, in particular, verse 11 speaks of the Spirit 'dividing to each one severally even as he will'. The whole language of this phrase is personal. Moreover it renders probable the translation 'apportionings' rather than 'diversities' in verses 4-6.¹ On these grounds Dr. Moffat's rendering in verse 13 'by one Spirit' is probably correct.² It seems that St. Paul found no difficulty in passing rapidly (as in this verse) from personal to impersonal language about the Spirit. Both corresponded to facts of experience. Moreover, whereas the language of the Old Testament is all but wholly impersonal, the language of the New Testament terminates in the highly personal language of John 14-16. A new factor was at work in the new creation, which called for new language about the Spirit, although the older ways of speaking were in no sense discarded.³

We cannot exclude a further consideration, which comes to mind when we turn to the final clause of this verse. The word rendered 'drink' in the Revised Version frequently means 'to irrigate'⁴ and so here. By a sudden change of metaphor we turn from the neophyte undergoing baptism to a piece of land saturated with water, whether by rain or by artificial processes. We were all 'imbued with one Spirit' (M). Here we are back

¹ διαίρεσις; cp. διαίρου in v. 11. So RP (ICC) *ad loc.*, pp. 262, 263. The variety of prepositions applied to the Spirit in vv. 8 and 9 may be simply for the sake of variation.

² So RP paraphrase: 'by means of one Spirit'

³ see further my book *The Incarnate Lord*, ch. 12

⁴ see MM and RP *ad loc.*

again in the Old Testament pictures of the Spirit as streams of water whose ultimate source is the celestial 'river of God' above the firmament. Now a torrent of water flowing down and moving swiftly across the land (whether in artificial channels or not) is like a live thing. Anything in its pathway is drenched 'by' it, immersed 'in' it and saturated 'with' it. So the Spirit of God is living and active in power; but also penetrating to the heart, like water drenching the ground. So too in Romans 5⁵ our hearts are like gardens, in which streams of divine love, descending from above, penetrate the thirsty ground.

The connexion of thought in 1 Corinthians 12¹²⁻¹⁴ must also be noticed. The organic unity of the many members in one body provides a picture to which the Messiah is to be compared. He also is One Body to whose unity we as the members belong. The explanation of this unity between Christ the Body and us his many members is to be found in the fact that 'by one Spirit we all were baptized into one body'. The unity of the Body is a living unity created and sustained by the one Spirit. The drenched soil holds together, whereas if left dry it would crumble apart into dust. This crumbling into the original constituents would certainly take place; for there is no sufficient natural kinship to hold together such contrasted and anti-pathetic elements as Jew and Greek, bond and free. 'For indeed the body is not one member, but many.' That is why its organic unity is actually so striking.

The unity of a natural organism is sustained only by the immanent creative activity of God's Spirit. Nothing else prevents the otherwise inevitable disintegration. This was for St. Paul the type of the supernatural unity of Christ's human organism. Its members are redeemed sinners who, apart from their common sharing in the one Spirit, would be separated and disintegrated by their sins. As it is they cannot disown their membership of the Body without flying in the face of facts (vv. 15ff). Now in Romans 5¹⁻¹¹ the given fact is presented not as membership together in one body, but as reconciliation to God in a new state of grace. The same principle holds, however. The unity of the Church is in two directions, horizontal and vertical; fellowship with man involves and implies fellowship with God, and both depend upon participation in the gift of the Spirit. The unity of the Body is sustained by the creative activity

of the Spirit. If we ask further what this activity may be, St. Paul replies that it is an outpouring of divine love. For the love of God alone is capable of overcoming the disruptive forces of sin. This it does by descending like showers of refreshing rain upon the hard crust of dry egoism 'in our hearts'. This crust of egoism is dissolved and the soil of the heart is opened to the penetrating influences of deity. Thus the sinner is brought back into vital communion with his Maker.

CHAPTER IV

PARTAKERS OF GOD'S LOVE

In Romans 5¹⁻¹¹ the love of God is mentioned twice. In verse 5 it is connected with the gift of the Spirit, and in verse 8 with Christ's death upon the Cross. The context links these statements with justification. A similar connexion of ideas occurs in Romans 8³¹⁻³⁹, where, however, justification has the wider sense of 'vindication' (v. 33). We know that God is 'for us', because he 'spared not his own Son'. The love of Christ has assured our victory; and none can separate us from that love. But that love is also inseparable from God's love (vv. 35, 37-39); and so nothing 'shall be able to separate us from the love of God in Christ Jesus our Lord'.

In both passages the love of God in Christ provides a foundation for the Christian assurance of salvation. But in Romans 5 this is brought into connexion with the corresponding truth that 'hope putteth not to shame, because the love of God has been poured out in our hearts through the Holy Ghost which was given unto us' (v. 5). So we know God's love in two distinct ways. We know it in Christ; and we know it through the gift of the Spirit. Now the relation of God's love to the gift of the Spirit, as set forth in Romans 5⁵, actually presupposes all that St. Paul held to be true about the relation of that love to the gracious act of Christ. This has already been indicated in verses 1-4; it is made still more explicit in verses 6-8. The sequence of thought in verses 5 and 6 is as follows: (i) Hope is not put to shame, because (ii) the love of God has been poured out. . . . We assent to this second statement and recognize its truth because (iii) 'while we were yet weak, in due season Christ died for the ungodly'.¹

¹ The Greek text at the beginning of v. 6 is uncertain, although the general sense is not in doubt. (1) If we adopt the RV reading (ἐτι γὰρ followed by a superfluous ἐτι) v. 6 provides an explanation of the reference to God's love in v. 5. This calls for a further explanation (v. 7); finally the proof of God's love by Christ's death for sinners is stated (v. 8). (2) If we accept the reading of B (ἐλ γέ), following WH with support from SH, the argument becomes more trenchant. Vv. 5 and 6 are now seen to state two

The step from (i) to (ii) is straightforward; but how are we to understand the step from (ii) to (iii)? In other words, how is the statement that God's love has been poured out in our hearts supported or clarified by the statement that Christ died for the ungodly? How does an event in history give meaning or reality to a fact of spiritual experience? The answer to this question is given in verse 8. The death of Christ upon the Cross embodied in concrete historical fact a new revelation of God's love. St. Paul could assign no special significance to the pentecostal outpouring of Love in the heart, except by reference to the historical events through which that Love had entered history. In the last chapter we saw that the spiritual event of our interior life described in verse 5 has no necessary connexion with floods of emotion. Such emotional floods might be wholly irrational. They might be subjective in the sense that they had no actual correspondence with truth. Verses 6-8 show that St. Paul had in mind something very different. The interior event described in terms of outpoured love is a spiritual illumination of the mind or soul.¹ The value of such an illumination depends, not upon the psychological factors accompanying it, but upon the truth of the revelation received.² The reality of God's love which enters the soul like a refreshing shower corresponds to the truth revealed in the death of Christ. The illumination of the mind with the truth of God's love is a genuine fact, so surely as the death of Christ for sinners is true. For if the second statement were not true, the first would have no basis in the actual world. In short it might be no better than an illusion. Christian faith and hope are grounded upon historical events; and only upon factors of the interior life so far as those interior factors are referred to the historical events and controlled by them.

parallel truths. A semi-colon only is required between the two verses. The statement of v. 5 is true 'so surely as' the following statement is also true. It is difficult to believe that so profound a connexion of thought can be due to an error in our most reliable manuscript! Neither accident nor emendation is likely to have improved on St. Paul's original statement. If, notwithstanding these considerations, the RV reading be preferred, the mutual relation between the two truths about God's love (vv. 5 and 8) still holds good, although stated in a more halting manner.

¹ The English word 'heart' is misleading; see further below, p. 103.

² The conception of a 'flood of light' would avoid the psychological error; it would not, however, reproduce the pentecostal associations of ἐκκέχυται

Attention must now be drawn to a fundamental presupposition of the argument which connects verses 6–8 with verse 5. It is presumed, as something which no Christian will question, that 'while we were yet weak, in due season Christ died for the ungodly'. This is repeated in a more direct form in verse 8: 'While we were yet sinners Christ died for us.' In 1 Corinthians 15^{1–3} we learn that St. Paul received this doctrine from the original apostles as an accepted tradition. Moreover a comparison of that passage with Romans 3^{23–26} and 4²⁵ makes plain the sense in which St. Paul understood the doctrine. It meant for him that Jesus of Nazareth brought to fulfilment the intimations of the Old Testament about atonement and expiation through vicarious suffering. The words 'in due season' draw attention to this relation of Christ's death to the Old Testament revelation.¹ There was nothing accidental about that death. In it God brought to fulfilment his whole purpose of salvation, which had previously been indicated only 'by divers portions and in divers manners' (Heb. 1¹). St. Paul's claim (1 Cor. 15^{1–3}) that this view of Christ's death was traditional is confirmed by the reports of the 'apostolic preaching' in Acts.² For the first Christians the death of Jesus was not simply an inspiring example of self-sacrifice, nor even the greatest of martyrdoms for truth and righteousness. It was both of these because it was much more. It was the death of the Messiah in expiation for the sins of the world and in fulfilment of God's age-long purpose. For Jesus was 'delivered up by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God' (Acts 2²³).

How vital this presupposition about Christ's death was for St. Paul can be seen from the course of his argument in Romans 5. In that argument we can distinguish three stages; and every point made is relevant to the connexion which St. Paul finds between the love of God on the Cross and the love of God 'in our hearts'.

(i) In verses 6–8 a contrast is drawn between the love revealed in Christ's death and the limited range of self-sacrifice displayed in ordinary human conduct. In verses 6 and 7 there is a double contrast (a) between 'the ungodly' for whom Christ

¹ see also Gal. 4⁴

² see p. 33, note 2; and compare the parallel corroboration of the language used in Rom. 5⁵ (above, p. 85). On 1 Cor. 15^{1ff} see further below, pp. 257 ff.

died and the 'righteous' man for whom 'scarcely will one die'; (b) between our 'weakness' upon which Christ took pity and the moral strength of the two types mentioned in verse 7. About our weakness St. Paul will have much to say at a later stage, especially in the picture of his own moral paralysis described in chapter 7.¹ It is remarkable that at this point no mention is made of parental affection, which, in animals as well as in human beings, commonly shows a complete devotion to the welfare of the offspring regardless of danger to the parent. The same is, of course, true in its measure of conduct dictated by sexual love in protection of the mate. 'To die for one's country' is again a form of self-sacrifice closely akin to these examples of natural altruism. These forms of self-sacrifice, however, have their roots in powerful natural instincts. For that very reason they do not provide the most suitable illustrations of the kind of self-sacrifice which St. Paul has in mind in this passage.

Such instances of natural affection, however, draw attention to a social principle deeply rooted in the order of creation. Moreover they have something in common with the example actually employed in verse 7. It is there pointed out that 'scarcely for a righteous man will one die'. The fact that a man lives a moral life—that he is 'righteous' in the Jewish sense of the word, or that he conforms to a high ethical code—is not in itself a fact likely to call forth from anyone else the supreme sacrifice of his own life. Men do not commonly risk their lives except for an overwhelming inducement. Such an inducement they do not find in correct conduct. There must be some compelling attraction. St. Paul suggests an instance of such compelling attraction, namely the good and noble character. The inspiring friend or leader for whom we might risk all is not the man who keeps all the correct rules, but the man who embodies our ideal of goodness. He is the man whose character has aroused our admiration and affection in a high degree. Self-sacrifice on behalf of such a person is not dictated by an imperious natural instinct like parental affection. It is a response to a revelation of goodness in one of its highest human forms. In its own measure it is even prophetic of much that belongs to the distinctively Christian ideal of self-sacrifice. Yet, for all that,

¹ On which see below, Chapter V, pp. 149 ff

it is separated by a great gulf from the sacrifice which Christ offered on behalf of sinners. It stands in contrast to that supreme sacrifice as a limited degree of 'disinterestedness' stands in contrast to the unlimited self-giving of divine love. It springs from a natural appreciation of the beauty exhibited in human nature when seen at its best. It thus bears witness to the image of God in man, and points beyond itself to the Creator. But the natural instincts of family affection also point beyond themselves to the Creator. For they are 'good' in their own order. There is however an important difference between conformity to instinct, however beautiful, and a response to revelations of 'the Good'. By passing over the strongest instances of natural affection St. Paul makes his argument all the more effective. He takes human nature at its highest level, and there shows the limitations of the human spirit.

St. Paul here draws attention to a truth of human nature which the philosopher Aristotle had pointed out long before. The social qualities exhibited in friendship have their starting-point in self-love. We are interested in another man's gifts and qualities, because of our common human nature. We see in a friend or a leader something which is the complement of ourselves. Our appreciation of his qualities may have in it nothing comparable either to parental or to filial affection. It has nothing to do with sexual love. Yet in a very different way friendship shares with these natural affections the characteristic that it is an extension of self-love. We love in our friend something complementary to ourselves; either because his qualities are in contrast to ours, or because they have a mysterious affinity with ours. The good man of whom St. Paul is speaking strikes a note with which, at least, we desire to be in harmony. Otherwise we should not appreciate his goodness, however real it might be. Accordingly the natural self-sacrifice on behalf of the good man who embodies our ideal may liberate us from narrow, petty forms of selfishness. Yet that liberation may actually have only the limited result that it extends the range of our self-interestedness. Such self-sacrifice may manifest the goodness of human nature in both the persons concerned. Yet it falls short immeasurably of the love revealed upon the Cross. There may be, and here there certainly is, a whole world of difference between the good and the best.

(ii) The difference lies in the fact that Christ died for sinners. Here we reach the second stage of the argument. Through his death upon the Cross our Lord gave to the world a revelation of God's love which was utterly new. In the Old Testament the teaching upon that subject, important as it is, is imperfect and limited, and that in three respects. For first, under the old covenant the love of God is neither completely universal in its range, nor completely personal in its concentration. For the most part it is concerned with Israel in contrast to other nations, and with individuals only as members of Israel. Secondly, although that love is displayed as showing pity for man's frailty and mercy for sinners, yet the response to that love which is required from man must be clothed in the form of obedience to the Law. Consequently its range and power remain gravely restricted, even at the highest levels of prophetic intuition. Lastly the love of God in the Old Testament is not incarnate in human form. Consequently a gulf still separates the divine Lover from the objects of his love, a gulf which is bridged only in Christ. So when the fullest allowance has been made for partial revelations of God's love to Jew and Gentile, it remains true that 'God proves his own love to us' in Jesus Christ and in him alone.

The older English versions prefer in verse 8 the possible rendering: 'God commendeth his love.' The Revised Version brings out correctly a further truth. It is God's own love which he so commends to us in Christ's death. This deepens the contrast. Christ died for sinners, not for good men; that is the first point. But further his death was not simply a superlative exhibition of human love. It was that; but it was more. Its vital importance to us sinners lies in the fact that it commends to us God's own love. For he 'spared not his own Son' (8³²). All of this is implicit in the thought of verse 8. Yet the stronger rendering—'God proves his own love'—is to be preferred.¹ For if our hope is not to flag under tribulation (vv. 2-5) we need an ever-renewed conviction grounded upon a solid assurance. We need assurance, both that God is love, and that all the resources of his love are at our disposal. This supreme assurance was given once for all when Christ died for us. Once more we recall the parallel passage in chapter 8: 'He that spared not his own Son,

¹ The 'proof' is, of course, moral not demonstrative

but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not also with him freely give us all things?

(iii) We thus return to a point reached in the last chapter. The love of God is for Christians inseparable from 'the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ' as that grace was manifested in the death upon Calvary. This truth, as stated in Romans 5⁸ and 8³², safeguards the doctrine of justification from a merely legalistic interpretation. So in verse 9 St. Paul passes back from thoughts of God's love to the language of justification, just as in verses 1-5 he had interpreted the state of justification in terms of peace, grace, joy, hope and love. In verses 9 and 10 we get a glimpse of that sinful state from which God's love has rescued us. The essence of that state is estrangement from God in hostility to his goodness. The destiny of those who persist in this hostility can be nothing but subjection to 'the wrath', that is to say the wholly adverse judgement of God upon their sinful attitude. This judgement manifests itself in a law of consequences which is as inevitable as the divine holiness. The first step, however, has been taken in our deliverance from that awful fate. That first step, we are now told, was so tremendous in its significance that it carries with it the promise of our final salvation.

The argument of verses 9-11 may be illustrated by two other sayings of St. Paul. The first of these (Rom. 6⁵) was considered above in Chapter II: 'If we have become united with him by the likeness of his death, we shall be also by the likeness of his resurrection.'¹ The second is addressed to the Philippians (1⁶), for whom the apostle gives thanks, 'being confident of this very thing, that he which began a good work in you will perfect it until the day of Jesus Christ.' All three statements emphasize the once-for-all character of that great transition which St. Paul identifies, from different points of view, both with baptism and with justification. The new creation carries with it the promise of its own completion; not because it is a predetermined sequence overruling our co-operation, but because it is from first to last a work of God's sovereign love. The Father gave his own Son to death; the Son died for sinners. God gave all in unmeasured love for those who were hostile to him. By this love our sins were expiated at a great price. Through Christ's death we were reconciled to that love, from which we had become

¹ see pp. 63-65 above

separated in hateful opposition. The love which can and will do this, can and will most surely bring us triumphantly to that glory for which we hope. The life laid down in such a death will surely have the power to bring us safely home. So the argument concludes upon the note of exultant joy with which it began (vv. 2, 3). It also carries us back, with this conclusion, to its centre in verse 5. The hope of the justified cannot be disappointed. For those who are reconciled salvation is secure. But not only so; since the end is already present in the beginning, we are in a position to exult in God through Christ, through whom we received the reconciliation which we now enjoy.¹ That reconciliation, received at our initiation, is a present reality which sustains our hope. For through the Spirit then given the love of God has been poured out in our hearts.

The statement of verse 5 is the key to the whole of this passage. What is its relation to the statement about God's love in Christ? The sequence of St. Paul's thought is greatly obscured by the English associations of the word 'heart'. The phrase 'in our hearts' suggests an emotional experience. But in Hebrew psychology 'the heart' represents the rational and spiritual nature of man. When St. Paul makes an appeal designed to stir the sympathetic emotions, he uses a word which refers to a quite different internal organ, as in Philemon²⁰. Yet the correct translation in that passage is undoubtedly: 'Refresh my heart in Christ'. For the English word 'heart' carries the right emotional associations.² Accordingly the statement of Romans 5⁵ refers to a transformation of our spiritual condition through an illumination of the mind. As soon as this is understood difficulties vanish, and the meaning of Romans 5⁵⁻⁸ becomes luminously clear. For verses 6-8 tell us that the love of God in Christ is beyond ordinary human understanding. There are truths which cannot be accepted, because they are beyond the mental horizon. The selfish man cannot believe that there is genuine joy in the unselfish life. There is, humanly speaking, an unbridgeable gulf in the *mind*, a gulf which represents a radical difference of character. God alone can alter such a state of things. That he can do so and has done so the New Testament bears witness.

¹ νῦν . . . ἐλάβομεν (v. 11)

² cp. Phil. 1⁷, ⁸ where M renders the phrase which includes ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ by: 'thinking of you,' and on the other hand σπλάγχνοις by 'affection'

St. Paul does not say that 'God proves his own love' to the selfish man who remains content with his selfishness. He proves it 'unto us' in whose 'hearts' the love of God has been poured out through the gift of the Spirit. Now if verse 5 is the key to the passage which we are considering, the key to verse 5 is the Greek word rendered 'has been poured out', the word which refers us back to the Day of Pentecost. The love of God on the Cross is a sealed book without the outpouring of the Spirit at Pentecost. The Acts of the Apostles makes this clear. The disciples were eye-witnesses of our Lord's Passion. They knew what had happened at Calvary. They had passed through the joys of Easter. Yet they were not qualified to interpret these events until the Spirit was poured out and they knew that Joel's prophecy was fulfilled. Calvary was interpreted in the light of Pentecost. The two events were mutually dependent. When the Spirit was given, then their minds were illuminated with the full truth of God's love in Christ. Pentecost presupposed Calvary and could have had no distinctive meaning without Calvary. Yet the meaning of Calvary became accessible only through the outpouring of the Spirit at Pentecost.

Pentecost brought an illumination of the mind which transformed their outlook. Everything looked different, as everything looks different when a drought is followed by a shower of rain. The very rays of the sun seem different in such circumstances! The rays which were scorching are now pleasantly warming. All the details of nature are the same; yet all have been transformed. So it was after Pentecost. The souls of the disciples were like watered gardens. With the descending streams of the Spirit came the revelation of God's love. The truth for which their souls thirsted now refreshed them. In them were fulfilled these words from the Psalter:

Thy loving kindness, O Lord, is in the heavens . . .
How precious is thy loving kindness, O God! . . .
They shall be watered¹ with the fatness of thy house;
And thou shalt make them drink of the river of thy pleasures.
For with thee is the fountain of life:
In thy light shall we see light. (Ps. 36⁵⁻⁹)²

¹ RV margin

² For the combination of metaphors (refreshment and illumination) see

The exultant note in Romans 5¹⁻¹¹ is due to this spiritual refreshment which is also illumination. For what happened in the Upper Room at Pentecost is renewed in every Christian soul through the gift of the Spirit. It is as though a river of light flowed down from the celestial fount to the hill of Calvary; from there into the Upper Room in Jerusalem; and from there continually through the baptismal channel into Christian hearts.

The most mysterious aspect of this passage can only be indicated here. The entry of God's love 'in our hearts' is described with a phrase which suggests the outpouring of the Spirit. Yet the language which seems to assert identity between divine love and the Spirit is also balanced by a distinction. For it is through the agency of the Holy Spirit as given, or through the instrumentality of the Spirit as gift, that the love is outpoured. Again, in verse 8 God proves his own love to us in the fact of Christ's death. But it was Christ who died for us while we were yet sinners. The distinction between God and Christ is essential to the proof; for God 'spared not his own Son'. Yet the love revealed on the Cross is God's own love, just as the pentecostal stream in the heart is God's own love.¹ These truths are self-evident to St. Paul; and he assumes that his readers will also accept them, because they share with him the same faith and life. But the whole passage is, for those who do not share the Christian faith, paradoxical in the extreme.

To those in whom the pentecostal outpouring has been renewed the death of Christ is the convincing proof of God's love, but not to others. For the love of God in Christ crucified is something altogether beyond the horizon of human understanding. Man as he is in himself cannot appreciate or accept it. For he is shut up within the narrow circle of his own self-interest, and can see no further than that self-interest allows. He can love them that love him, and do good to those who do good to him. But the God who is 'kind toward the unthankful and evil'² is to him frankly incomprehensible. This mysterious

also 1 Sam. 14²⁹: 'mine eyes have been enlightened, because I tasted'; cp. also Ps. 34⁸: 'O taste and see that the Lord is good.'

¹ Such language suggests the doctrine of 'coinherence' between the Persons of the Godhead

² Luke 6³⁵; see the whole passage (vv. 27-38)

limitation which is touched upon in Romans 5⁷ is treated more fully in an earlier epistle:

For the word of the cross is to them that are perishing foolishness; but unto us which are being saved it is the power of God. . . .

Seeing that Jews ask for signs and Greeks seek after wisdom: but we preach a Messiah¹ crucified, unto the Jews a stumblingblock, and unto Gentiles foolishness, but unto the called themselves,¹ both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God. (1 Cor. 1¹⁸, 22-24)

These words introduce a contrast between two kinds of wisdom. One is 'the wisdom of this world', which, at its best, is the wisdom of ennobled self-interest referred to in Romans 5⁷. At its worst, however, it was the wisdom of the Powers who crucified Christ.²

On the other side is the wisdom of 'the God to whom you owe your being in Christ Jesus, whom God has made our Wisdom, that is, our righteousness and consecration and redemption.'³ We have access to this wisdom because we are 'in Christ Jesus'. In him we have access to and possess the wisdom which he exemplified and embodied once for all upon the Cross. This is so because of all that he is to us. He is the new righteousness, and we partake of that righteousness in him. Through identification with him in his righteousness we share his consecration to God's service. Moreover both of these things are possible because he is our redemption. He is the redemption which he accomplished once for all; for it has no existence apart from him. He is also our redemption; for it is being completed in us who are his members. So 'let him who boasts boast of the Lord'.⁴ Our wisdom lies in recognizing what God has wrought in Christ. For we can know God's love only through the acts by which he makes that love known to us. We have access to God only because he himself has created the way of access for us.⁵ 'God in Christ was reconciling the world to himself, not reckoning unto them their trespasses.'⁶ The Father gave his Son; he also gave the Spirit through the Son. The act of love whereby he gave the Son has, therefore, set in motion the whole train of events, through which that love eventually reaches and penetrates the heart of man.

¹ RV margin

⁴ 1 Cor. 1³¹ (M)

² 1 Cor. 2⁶⁻⁸

⁵ Rom. 5¹, 2

³ 1 Cor. 1³⁰, following M

⁶ 2 Cor. 5¹⁹

Moreover the outpouring of the Spirit upon the community of the first disciples created a place of access, wherein the love of God could reach its goal in us. 'This grace where we have our standing' has its *locus* in the Body of Christ. The acts of God's love come to fruition in the reconciled community. In that community God has lodged the message of reconciliation whereby his love is to reach men's hearts and to evoke their response.¹ So it was that St. Paul, when he came to Corinth,² 'determined not to know anything among you, save Jesus Christ and him crucified.' He did not rely upon worldly wisdom. Perhaps his experience at Athens had shown him the unprofitableness of that method. In an educated but non-Christian community the Gospel seldom makes an appeal, in the first instance, to the intellectuals. For their developed presuppositions have been formed on the basis of enlightened self-interest with its restricted horizons. The Gospel cannot be fitted into such an outlook. The presuppositions must first be shattered. This takes place most frequently, not through a battle of wits, but through the sustained witness of life and character manifested in the redeemed fellowship. Men are reconciled to God, not by argument, but through the witness of the reconciled community to the crucified and risen Lord. So the apostle's message and its proclamation 'were not in persuasive words of wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power' (1 Cor. 2²⁻⁵). He preached the Cross as the proof of God's love; and in doing so he relied solely upon the power of the Spirit to demonstrate the truth of God's love as revealed in Christ crucified.

In the passage which follows (2⁶⁻¹⁶) the identification of the true wisdom with Christ is the guiding thought. But as the argument advances its implications develop until the culminating point is reached in verse 16. There is a wisdom of God about which St. Paul had much to say, but only among those who are 'mature' Christians. For the wisdom which has its centre in Christ belongs to a realm of thought wholly different

¹ 2 Cor. 5^{19b, 20}; but the truth of these statements depends upon the 'double polarity' of the Body of Christ (1 Cor. 12¹²). It requires to be safeguarded by further distinctions developed in Part II; see below, pp. 298ff, and above, pp. 57, 64, n. 1.

² Acts 18¹⁻¹⁸

from that of 'this age'¹ and its Rulers. Christian maturity is not to be sought in worldly wisdom, but in the understanding of God's purpose in Christ. The two wisdoms are in opposition to one another; and the conflict between them came to a head in our Lord's crucifixion. In Christ there was manifested God's wisdom, that is his whole preordained plan for 'our glory', which had been hidden in the divine counsels. This wisdom, wrapped 'in a secret', was unknown to 'the rulers of this age', who were, in St. Paul's belief, angelic beings hostile to the divine plan. In 2 Corinthians 4⁴ 'the god of this age'² is said to have 'blinded the thoughts of the unbelieving that the light of the gospel of the glory of Christ should not dawn upon them'. Similarly in the present passage these 'rulers' 'crucified the Lord of the Glory'. For they had access only to the wisdom of 'this age' and therefore could not recognize the Glory of which Christ is the Lord. The men who crucified Christ were merely instruments of these Powers and shared their blindness (vv. 6-8).³

But the apparent defeat of Christ was actually his victory. By his death the hostile powers were dethroned. They are even now being brought to nought (v. 6). Our wisdom, then, is the victorious wisdom of the Cross which we have in Christ. For though hidden from the hostile powers 'the secret' of God in Christ is now laid open to us by God's own act:

Things which eye saw not, and ear heard not,
And which entered not into the heart of man,
Whatsoever things God prepared for them that love him. (v. 9)

St. Paul here adapts some words from the book of Isaiah, perhaps combining them with a phrase from Ecclesiasticus.⁴ Those who love God are those who receive his revelation of wisdom in Christ crucified. The truth taught in 1 John 4¹⁹ is implicit here as well as in Romans 5⁵⁻⁸: 'We love, because he first loved us.' The things which God 'prepared' are beyond the powers of the human mind either to observe or to discover. They can be known only by revelation. But God will not force them upon those who do not desire to know his will. It has been supposed that this language about things prepared refers to future bliss.

¹ in contrast with 'the age to come'

² cp. Eph. 2², John 14³⁰

³ cp. Luke 23³⁴

⁴ Isa. 64⁴, Eccus. 1¹⁰; cp. Moffatt (M) p. 31

Such an idea cannot be excluded. But the context shows that verse 9 refers to the wisdom of which 'the rulers of this age' were ignorant when they crucified our Lord. It is the wisdom manifested in the crucified Lord. He is the Lord of that Glory upon which our future glory depends. The glories of the New Age were already present upon Calvary. The things which God prepared for those who love him are all summed up in Christ crucified. He is our wisdom, our glory and our joy. We can desire no other. In him God proved his love to us. That love he prepared in Christ for those in whom it calls forth an answering love. 'For to us God revealed them through the Spirit.'

What was hidden from the world-rulers was revealed to the apostles and to those who received their message in the Christian community. It was revealed through the Spirit; for 'the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God' (v. 10). What is in a man's mind is accessible only to his own spirit. This obvious truth illustrates the profounder mystery; only the Spirit of God has access to 'the things of God'. So deep answers to deep. The wisdom of God on the Cross can be interpreted only by the Spirit (v. 11). Now 'we received, not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is of God; that we might know the things that were freely given to us by God.' The argument is substantially the same as in Romans 5. The things which God 'prepared' were 'freely given to us' once for all in Christ crucified. They were revealed to us by the outpouring of the Spirit which we received: corporately once for all at Pentecost, individually once for all in our Christian initiation (v. 12). The apostle's own preaching corresponded to these facts. He did not come to Corinth with a message of human wisdom. His message was about the deep things of God's love in Christ. His utterance was conformed to its content. No human words can do justice to ineffable things. But the Spirit teaches language to fit the revelation which he conveys (v. 13). This is, perhaps, a personal explanation. In the last three verses we return to matters of wider import.

In verse 11 the apostle had referred to 'the spirit of the man', showing that he recognized in man, as such, a spiritual nature or a capacity for things spiritual. Now, however, (vv. 14, 15) he draws a contrast between two types of men. The one he characterizes with a word which emphasizes the natural life of

'the soul';¹ the other he calls 'the spiritual man'. The man who is here called 'spiritual' is not by nature a more spiritual person than the other with whom he is contrasted. The apostle is thinking, not of two *kinds* of human nature, but of human life lived at two different *levels*, a lower and a higher. Man as such is a spiritual being, so far as all are created 'spirits'. But not all are actually spiritual. For the spirit of man is not self-sufficient. It can be brought to its true level of fulfilment only through the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. Without the refreshing waters of the Holy Spirit the spirit of man wilts and withers. Then the man becomes little better than an animated body. In some respects he becomes worse than the animals. For their life is natural. But the man who is not illuminated and renewed by the Holy Spirit is in an 'unnatural' state. For his 'natural' life falls short of the glory of God, of which it was destined to be the created likeness.²

Such a man does not accept the things of the Spirit. They are to him mere folly; and he cannot understand them. For he is unilluminated. The love of God has not been poured out in his heart through the gift of the Spirit. He still moves within the restricted circle of his 'natural' self-interest. At his best such a man is capable of sacrifice for a 'good' which he can appreciate.³ But for all that he is imprisoned within the four walls of his own ego; he is subject to 'the spirit of the world', the spirit by which Christ was crucified. To be actually 'spiritual' a man must be conformed in mind and will to the purpose of God. That purpose was summed up in Christ. A 'wisdom' which does not take account of Christ crucified is out of court. It is not in a position to judge, but rather to be judged. It must abide the judgement of those who know. On the other hand the man in whom the Holy Spirit dwells has access to the purpose of God in Christ. He is illuminated by the light of God's love in Christ. He is subject to no human judgements; for he shares the very thoughts of Christ crucified. Just so far as he shares Christ's thoughts, his own thoughts are secure from judgement.⁴ The man who has mastered truth in any sphere is immune from criticism in that sphere. 'The spiritual man' has the immunity

¹ hence 'the natural man' of AV and RV

² 1 Cor. 11⁷, Rom. 3²³

³ Rom. 5⁷

⁴ cp. Gal. 5²³: 'against such there is no law'

of the expert. His wisdom, being the higher, includes the truth about the wisdom of this world. The latter, on the other hand, can know only itself, and that with the distorted outlook of its restricted vision. This is the spiritual truth which is stated in a more apocalyptic form in 6²: 'the saints shall judge the world.' They shall share the judicial functions of the Son of Man.

This is an exalted claim. But verse 16 carries it higher still.¹ The claim is based upon the fact that the man who is illuminated by the Holy Spirit is a partaker in the very thoughts of Christ. The quotation in the first half of the verse makes it clear that Christ's thoughts are God's thoughts. To partake of one is to partake of the other. In the language of 6² this means that as the saints share Christ's throne of judgement, so Christ shares the Father's throne of judgement. 'The spiritual man' is enthroned with the Deity above the judgements of this world. This claim is so stupendous that we must examine it closely. The quotation comes from the Greek version of Isaiah 40¹³, where we read: 'Who knew the mind of the Lord, and who became his counsellor who instructeth him?'² The context exalts the power and knowledge of God as the Creator in contrast to the littleness of man. 'Mind' therefore means 'creative thought'. God has no human counsellors to instruct him. To claim such a prerogative would be blasphemy. But St. Paul says that to judge Christ's thoughts (in which we share) is the same as to judge God's thoughts. So to judge would be the blasphemy condemned by implication in the text from Isaiah. Now although no man may presume to instruct God, the Creator is not without a counsellor. For his Wisdom was present with him at the creation;³ and Christ, whose thoughts are the Creator's thoughts, is here identified with that eternal Wisdom.

The connexion of thought is well illustrated by a passage in the Wisdom of Solomon:

For what man shall know the counsel of God?
Or who shall conceive what the Lord willeth? . . .

¹ For the correct interpretation of this verse I am under obligations to the commentary of Dr. J. Moffatt (M) *ad loc.*, pp. 33-35 and to Canon W. L. Knox, *St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles*, pp. 116-118

² The Hebrew has 'spirit' for 'mind'

³ Prov. 8²²⁻³¹, cp. Wisd. 7²²⁻⁹

And who ever gained knowledge of thy counsel except thou gavest wisdom,

And sentest thy holy spirit¹ from on high? (Wisd. 9¹³, 17)

The Christian who has received the Holy Spirit is a partaker in Christ's thoughts. But Christ is that eternal Wisdom which was present at the creation as 'the artificer of all things' (Wisd. 7²²). The thoughts of the Crucified are therefore the thoughts of the Creator. For God and his Wisdom have one mind.

This passage (1 Cor. 2¹⁶) asserts the deity of him who was crucified. It shows the beginning of a line of thought in St. Paul which became fully explicit in the Johannine writings.² It discloses the fact that the common life which we share in the Church is a partaking of the life common to God and his Christ before the world began. Thus it throws further light upon Romans 5⁵⁻⁸. The death of Christ proves God's love, because the mind of Christ is eternally one with God. When the love of God is poured out 'in our hearts', the thoughts of the crucified Lord enter our minds. By sharing his thoughts we share the life of God. In so far as we share the thoughts of the crucified Lord we are at the centre of reality and no judgement can touch us. But the condition is a tremendous qualification. The Christ-centred man partakes of God's life; and so his own spirit is no longer the centre. He is spiritual because his own spirit is surrendered to the Spirit of God in an effacement which is also fulfilment. He has the clue to everything, because God is at the centre of his life, illuminating it; whereas in his unrenewed state his own ego was at the centre obscuring everything. The thoughts of God remain utterly mysterious. Yet the Holy Spirit leads our finite spirits into these thoughts in Christ through the outpouring of love in our hearts from the Cross.

The saints judge the world, if they share the life of Christ crucified. The condition recalls the two aspects of our grafting into Christ. The process of 'union by growth' is gradual. St. Paul's discourse on the two wisdoms was occasioned by the spiritual immaturity of his readers. For this epistle is addressed

¹ Here AV prints 'Holy Spirit'. RV refers to the Spirit of God without capital letters in the Scriptures of the old covenant, reminding us that in them the Christian revelation is foreshadowed, but not fully manifested. *In vetere novum latet.*

² see below, Chapter VI, pp. 156ff

to a Christian congregation which is frankly told that it is composed of 'babes in Christ' (3¹), that is, persons incapable of understanding the deeper truths of the revelation which Christ brought. The reason for their continuance in this state is connected with the fact that they are in the habit of overestimating the value of mere cleverness. They are too fond of an ostentatious intellectualism or of showy gifts. In their egotistical vanity they do not as yet understand that genuine wisdom involves moral as well as intellectual factors, and that these moral factors are created by God's love in Christ through the power of the Holy Spirit. The things upon which they were setting such high value belong to the spirit of the world, not to the Spirit of God. They were seeking maturity along a line of advance the exact opposite of that along which alone it can be found. The true maturity is given by the Spirit to those who share the Cross. The highest things to which men can aspire are never the product of their own achievements. They are gifts freely bestowed by God upon those who sincerely seek him. 'So you must not boast about men. For all belongs to you,' including the apostles whom they would like to set up as rival party-leaders. 'All belongs to you,' but on one stupendous condition. Their possessive egotism must be dethroned. For 'you belong to Christ, and Christ to God' (3²¹⁻²³).¹ Their only ground for boasting or exultation lies in God himself (1³¹).² We are reminded of similar warnings to the Romans (12^{2, 3, 16}) and of the recommendation: 'Let us exult in hope of the glory of God' (5²).³

We are partakers of God's love through sharing Christ's thoughts and purpose as revealed on the Cross; and to both of these we have access through the gift of the Spirit. Further light upon these conceptions is to be found in aspects of St. Paul's teaching which draw together the two ways of stating the significance of the *koinonia*.⁴ The two ways, it will be remembered, refer respectively to our participation in Christ, and to

¹ M; cp. in other connexions 6^{19, 20}, 7^{22, 23}; and in the present context 1²⁶⁻³¹

² cp. 2 Cor. 10¹⁷

³ RV margin here and in 5¹¹, as also RV text elsewhere, renders *καυχᾶσθαι* by the word 'glory', which the Revisers also used for *δόξα*. This is unfortunate and confusing.

⁴ see above, pp. 76, 77

our participation in the Spirit. One passage in particular has obvious relevance:

But when the fulness of the time came, God sent forth his Son, born¹ of a woman, born under the law, that he might redeem them which were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons.² And because ye are sons, God sent forth the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying, Abba, Father. So that thou art no longer a bondservant, but a son; and if a son, then an heir through God. (Gal. 4⁴⁻⁷)

This passage is remarkable both for the careful precision of its statements and for the balance of its thought. It contains three main statements. The first connects our adoption with God's sending forth of his Son into the world to redeem 'them which were under the law'. The second connects the sending forth of 'the Spirit of his Son into our hearts' with the fact of our sonship. The third affirms the consequences for the individual Christian: 'No longer a slave, but a son; . . . if a son, then an heir through God.' This passage is also closely related to the argument of chapter 3. It concludes with the phrase 'heir through God', which carries us back to the last words of chapter 3: 'If ye are Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, heirs according to promise.' Chapter 4¹⁻⁷ recapitulates the argument of chapter 3 (especially vv. 23-29) in a new form. In both chapters Christ is the liberator who ransoms us from the slavery of law and legalism. But in chapter 3 he is Abraham's promised Seed who includes us in himself as 'heirs according to promise'; whereas in 4¹⁻⁷ he is the Son of God who makes us partakers of his sonship. So in chapter 3 Christ, the promised Seed, secures for us 'the promise of the Spirit' (v. 14); whereas in 4¹⁻⁷, the sending of the Son having secured our adoption, the Spirit of his Son is sent by God to complete our sonship (v. 6). It is also to be noticed that the new form of the argument introduces a change of language with respect to the 'heir'. In 3²⁹ the 'heirs according to promise' are referred to under that designation because they have already entered upon their inheritance in

¹ γενόμενον; contrast γέννηται in 4²³, and compare Rom. 1³, Phil. 2⁷, John 1¹⁴, see below, p. 270, n. 2

² τὴν υἱοθεσίαν, which occurs nowhere in the Greek Bible outside the Pauline Epistles. See Burton, *op. cit.*, pp. 220, 221; he renders the word: 'installation as a son'.

Christ. The later passage, having explained the stages by which this result was effected, concludes triumphantly with a similar use of the word 'heir' (4⁷). In 4¹⁻³, however, a quite different conception of 'the heir' is introduced.

In 4¹⁻³ St. Paul uses an illustration already employed in a slightly different form in 3²³⁻²⁵. This shows 'the heir', not enjoying his inheritance, but still under tutelage, during his legal infancy. Though he is titular 'lord of all', yet his position is, for the time being, no better than that of a slave. Such was the condition of Jews and Gentiles alike before the coming of Christ (4³, cp. 3²³).¹ We were destined to enter upon the inheritance 'when the faith had come' (3²⁵).² But until it came we had not the recognized status of heirs. Does St. Paul mean that the Galatians, before becoming Christians, were already God's sons in some sense, although their status as such was not yet recognized? That would be a natural deduction from the illustration. If so, their previous sonship was potential rather than actual. For in 3²⁶ we are told that 'ye are all sons

¹ St. Paul is thinking mainly of the Jews under the Mosaic Law 'which became our "pedagogue" with a view to Christ'. The 'pedagogue' was not a teaching 'tutor' or a 'schoolmaster', but a servant who looked after the adolescent boy. Jewish 'sonship' was therefore of a lower kind than Christian sonship. This raises no difficulty. But as the argument proceeds the Gentile Galatians become included in the same scheme of tutelage with a view to full sonship in Christ (e.g. 3²⁶, 4^{5, 6, 7}). This inclusion of the Gentiles in the lower sonship before their baptism appears to become explicit in 4^{8, 9}, where they are told that by Judaizing they will return to the state of slavery which belonged to their heathen days. We cannot be certain whether St. Paul is here thinking in terms (a) of a sonship of all men by creation, as in the speech at Athens (Acts 17²⁶⁻²⁹), or (b) of a predestination of Gentiles to Christian sonship as in Rom. 8²⁹ (cp. Eph. 1^{4, 5}). There is, however, a third possibility: (c) By comparison with Christian sonship Jews and Gentiles alike were in a state of slavery. Thinking in terms of Judaism St. Paul can dignify this slavery by ascribing to it the lower sonship of tutelage. But when the Galatians show a hankering after Judaism as the true sonship, he tells them roundly that by comparison with their Christian privileges it is no better than their heathen servitude. Thus in the passage as a whole Gentile Christians are included in the sonship of the people of God; as such they are regarded as sharing the same spiritual ancestry, which was that of the Old Testament dispensation. See further below, Chapter VI, esp. pp. 172 ff and p. 186. For 'pedagogue' see Burton, *op. cit.*, p. 200 and MM, p. 473³.

² The article defines 'the faith' in question as 'faith in Christ' which was to be revealed (vv. 22, 23). But in v. 26 it may mean 'your faith' (Burton, pp. 202, 203).

of God' in virtue of two indispensable conditions: (a) 'through the faith',¹ and (b) 'in Christ Jesus'. Now both of these conditions are declared in the context to be incompatible with the state of tutelage. For 'before the faith came, we were kept guarded under law' (3²³); whereas, 'the faith having come, we are no longer under a pedagogue' (3²⁵). Moreover 'the faith' in question is faith in Christ. Through this faith we receive the promise; and to be the heirs of the promise belongs only to those who are 'in Christ' (3², 10-25, 27-29).

There may be stages in the history of Christian sonship. But it is clear from 4⁴⁻⁷ that we 'receive the adoption' as a result of the Incarnation. In verses 4, 5 our adoption by God is said to be a consequence of his sending his Son to ransom us from slavery. Again, in verse 6 the adoption established upon that foundation is completed by God's sending forth 'the Spirit of his Son'. The two illustrations (a) from the guardianship of children under age, and (b) from the practice of adoption² are really quite different. St. Paul has not troubled to co-ordinate them precisely. The former suggests a graded history of sonship reaching back into pre-Christian days. The latter lays all the emphasis upon the new privileges of the Christian life.³ It is this idea which fills the picture in 4⁴⁻⁷. Here the purpose for which God sent his Son is said to be twofold. The Son was sent (i) to effect our ransom from slavery in order that (ii) we might receive the adoption. The slaves, it is implied, were ransomed; and the way was then open for the adoption which followed.⁴

A further difficulty presents itself in the language which St. Paul uses in verse 6. Here we read: 'And because ye are sons, God sent forth the Spirit of his Son into our hearts.' This sentence appears to mean that the Spirit was sent into our hearts because we had already, and previously, received the status of sonship. Thus the clause 'because ye are sons' gives 'the reason in the divine mind for the act'⁵ whereby God sent the Spirit. Does the apostle intend to make a distinction between

¹ see previous note

² current at the time, although not Jewish

³ see also note 1 on p. 115 above

⁴ following Burton's rendering of v. 5 (*op. cit.*, p. 220) rather than that of M: 'have our sonship' (ed. 1935) or 'get our sonship' (ed. 1926), with which compare Duncan (M) *ad loc.*, pp. 124, 130.

⁵ Burton, p. 221

two events in temporal sequence, the first of these being our adoption as sons and the second the sending of the Spirit into our hearts? If so, when did the events occur? Or again, is he referring to two aspects of the same event, which we may be obliged to think of in temporal sequence, although actually they are inseparable?¹

Now we know that our adoption to be sons is a consequence of the fact that God sent his Son to ransom us from slavery. The adoption, at least so far as it becomes actual in us, is later in time than the mission of the Son, of which it is a consequence (4⁴, 5). Secondly, in 3²⁶, 27 the Galatians were told that their sonship became actual through baptism. We cannot be sons of God except through the inclusion 'in Christ Jesus' which took place for each of us when we 'put on' Christ in baptism. That is the teaching of this epistle. It follows, then, that the words 'because ye are sons' (4⁶) presuppose baptism, as well as the whole redemptive work of Christ upon which the significance of baptism is founded. Our adoption by God to be his sons is the result of his whole act in Christ. That act began with the sending of the Son into this world, when the Son took our nature and was born of a woman. It was carried on through the messianic events of the Son's death, resurrection and ascension, and again through the outpouring of the Spirit upon the Church. It reaches individual sinners through their membership in Christ; and that membership is effected in baptism. So all are sons of God through their faith in Christ and through their membership in him (3²⁶). It is because of all this that 'God sent forth the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying, Abba, Father' (4⁶).

This second act of sending is described with precisely the same word as was employed in verse 4 to describe the sending of the Son. Moreover the same tense is employed, indicating an event which took place on a definite occasion. Further, as it was God who sent his Son, so also it was God who sent the Spirit of his Son. Here, however, the parallel between the two 'missions', as described in the present passage, is carried no further. At this point a contrast begins. For whereas the first sending issued in a single event, the entry of God's Son into this world and into our human nature, the second sending issued in many

¹ see p. 69 and n. 2

events in many human lives. It issued in the entry of the Spirit 'into our hearts, crying, Abba, Father'. When did this entry of the Spirit into our hearts occur? The tense suggests a single event in the life of each Christian. The same tense is employed in 1 Corinthians 6¹¹ and 12¹³, and again for the gift of the Spirit referred to in Romans 5⁵. Reasons were given in Chapter III for referring the descriptions in all of these three texts to the same event, namely baptism.¹ Moreover there are points of affinity between Galatians 4⁶ and Romans 5⁵ which suggest that they both refer to the same event. These must now be considered.

In Galatians 4⁶ the fact of our sonship to God, effected by the whole act of God in his Son, is represented as having been implemented through a sending of the Spirit into our hearts. In Romans 5⁵ our access to God in the state of grace, previously referred to the mediation of Christ (5¹, 2), is traced through its effects to its immediate source. That source is a gift of the Spirit, whereby the love of God has been poured out in our hearts. The verbal correspondence which strikes the eye at once lies in the fact that both texts refer to 'our hearts'. It has been pointed out that, in its biblical use, the word 'heart' has not the predominantly emotional associations which it has in English. The love of God upon the Cross, penetrating the 'heart', brings about a consequent illumination of the mind. To the renewed man there are revealed by the Holy Spirit treasures of heavenly wisdom, whose scope and significance lie beyond the horizons of the as yet untransformed spirit of man.

Both passages refer to the same spiritual realities. What is in the heart must enter the heart. Romans tells us that God's love entered our hearts through a definite gift of the Spirit. Galatians tells us that on a definite occasion God sent the Spirit into our hearts. But further, whereas in Romans the gift of the Spirit brings God's love to us, in Galatians the Spirit is represented as evoking in us a response to that love. The two ideas are complementary. Again in Romans the divine love poured out is revealed and proved in the death of God's Son. In Galatians the human response to that love is evoked by the Spirit of God's Son. In Christ we see the love of the Father; in Christ we also see the filial response proper to the Son. It is to

¹ see pp. 82-95 above

be noticed that the words 'Abba, Father' occur only three times in the New Testament. Of these three, two are in St. Paul's epistles, the other instance being in Romans 8¹⁵. Besides Galatians 4⁶ and Romans 8¹⁵ there is only Mark 14³⁶, which records our Lord's prayer in the garden of Gethsemane at the beginning of his Passion: 'Abba, Father, all things are possible unto thee; remove this cup from me: howbeit not what I will, but what thou wilt.' With this cry our Lord accepted his Father's will. With these words the Son accepted the Cross. The cry must have made an indelible impression upon St. Peter; and so it was recorded in the Gospel of St. Mark. The word 'Abba' must have been often upon our Lord's lips. But this was the cry specially remembered. It was the pattern cry of filial response. In it all Christians are made partakers. For 'God sent forth the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying, Abba, Father.'

But although partakers we are also sinners, restored to God's love through the loving response of his Son. Accordingly Galatians 4⁶ (and also Romans 8¹⁵) describes the liberation of sinners from thralldom to sonship. This liberation is expressed in a cry like that of the lost son in the parable (Luke 15²¹). The penitent son, returning and intending to offer himself for a lowly position as hired servant, was met by the father, who saw him at a distance, and ran forward eagerly to greet him. Love evoked love in that exquisite meeting. The son found himself no longer a disgraced exile, nor even a hired man, restored but under contract to serve. His servile status (Luke 15¹⁵) was a thing of the past. He knew himself once more as a son, a most favoured object of love in his father's house. 'So that thou art no longer a slave, but a son; and if a son, then also an heir through God' (Gal. 4⁷). If at this point in his argument St. Paul had in mind our Lord's parable,¹ that fact would give point to his use of the phrase 'into our hearts'. The cry: 'Abba, Father' on the lips of sinners is the cry of the penitent. It issues from a change of heart, which in the New Testament is called a 'change of mind'.² In the parable that process began when the lost son came to himself and began to understand his lost condition (Luke 15¹⁷). But it was not completed, until the father had himself taken action, when 'he ran and fell on his neck and

¹ so Duncan (M) *ad loc.*, p. 132

² *μετάνοια*

kissed him'. Then at last the change was complete, and the cry rang out: 'Father, I sinned against heaven and before thee, I am no more worthy to be called thy son.' He was now a renewed man. Now for him had begun the life-long process, which is expressed in the precept: 'Be ye transformed by the renewing of the mind' (Rom. 12²).¹

The cry of the penitent son was evoked by the love of the father, and it took a more intimate form than the son had intended. There is no more thought of becoming a hired servant; he knows that he is forgiven and restored.² This final touch shows what God's love can do. It is his love poured out in our hearts which brings us from servitude back into sonship. Now this love poured out in the heart was first revealed upon Calvary and then entered the heart through the gift of the Spirit. But the love thus revealed upon Calvary was the love of the Father shown forth in the Son. It was shown forth in two ways: (1) first in the fact that the Father gave the Son for our salvation (John 3¹⁶); (2) secondly in the response of the Son to such a Father, in the willingness of the Son to die for us in obedient fulfilment of the love which was both the Father's and the Son's. Now as recipients of God's love we share the thoughts of Christ (as he shares the Father's) through the gift of the Spirit. This is expressed in Galatians by the statement that 'God sent forth the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying, Abba, Father'. Here it is the Spirit of the Son who utters in us the Father's Name. In the parallel passage in Romans the complementary truth is stated:

For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, these are sons of God. For ye received not the spirit of bondage again unto fear; but ye received the Spirit³ of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father. The Spirit himself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are children of God. (Rom. 8¹⁴⁻¹⁶)

Here it is stated that the cry is our own; although in making it we are actuated by the Spirit. But a sentence is added which represents the complementary truth. If the cry is our act, we

¹ see above, pp. 60, 61

² The repetition in v. 21 of the final phrase in v. 19 is clearly not original

³ Sometimes in N.T. (as here) RV prints 'spirit' without a capital letter, to indicate a doubt as to whether the word means 'the Holy Spirit'. This peculiarity is not retained in quotations from RV in the present work.

can make it only because we received the Spirit of adoption. So when we make it, it is a joint act of the Spirit's and ours. The Spirit corroborates the internal testimony of the renewed man that he is God's child.¹ The more articulated statement of Romans here makes explicit the truth that there is no suspension of human faculties through the indwelling action of the Spirit. In this the present passage is to be compared with Philippians 2^{12,13}. We are permitted to co-operate with the divine agent. On the other hand in Galatians 4⁶ the more fundamental truth is stated starkly without qualification. Our response is wholly the work of the Spirit, who is the Spirit of God's Son in us. In its objective character this statement is to be compared with the utterance of Galatians 2²⁰: 'It is no longer I that live, but Christ liveth in me.' The latter is itself an example of what St. Paul meant by the Spirit crying in the heart. The Spirit of the Son makes the Son's response to the Father in us. So the life of the renewed man is no longer his own, but the life of Christ in him. At this point it becomes possible to see more clearly the interconnexion between the two Missions, which are set parallel to one another in Galatians 4⁴⁻⁶, and further the significance of the phrase 'because ye are sons', in which that interconnexion occurs.

The relation between the two Missions may be expressed by saying that God sent his Son that we might become sons, and that he sent the Spirit to make our sonship effectual. Another aspect of the relation would be expressed by saying that through the sending of the Son we are in the Son, whereas through the sending of the Spirit the Son is in us. The understanding of these truths may be assisted by recalling explanations offered in an earlier chapter concerning 'double polarity' in the new organism of Christ and again concerning a similar twofoldness about the Christian life.² Those explanations were connected with St. Paul's use of an illustration from grafting, when he declared in Romans 6⁵ that 'if we have become united by growth with the likeness of Christ's death, we shall be also with the likeness of his resurrection'. It was pointed out in

¹ following the punctuation of RV and WH with SH; if the punctuation of WH margin and M, followed by Dodd (M), be adopted, the main emphasis lies upon the joint witness of the Spirit, rather than his agency, in the cry.

² see above, Chapter II, pp. 57-65

connexion with that passage that the illustration suggests two stages. The first of these stages represents our removal from the fallen race of Adam and our incorporation into Christ, as a branch is grafted into a tree. The second stage represents our assimilation to the life of Christ, so that our life, nourished by his, partakes of its quality and character and is conformed to its pattern and law. Now in Galatians 4⁴⁻⁷ St. Paul seems to have in mind a similar conception of two stages, although the whole choice of language is quite different.

In Romans 6 the two stages are concerned respectively with death and resurrection. By union with Christ we first die to the old life of sin through our transference from the old order to the new, and then there begins a process of assimilation to the new life which issues in resurrection. In this way baptism is seen to be both a deliverance once for all from sin and the starting-point of a gradual transformation. Now in Galatians St. Paul is speaking, not about death and resurrection, but about slavery and sonship. The great transition here is not from the death of sin to the new life of righteousness, but from the bondage of the law to the freedom of sons. Also it must be borne in mind that the illustration of grafting in Romans 6 is completed by a description of the new life in Romans 8. In that chapter the work of the Holy Spirit in the Christian life is described in a manner which carries into fuller details the brief statement of Galatians 4⁶ and the further explanations given in Galatians 5. The first stage of the great change from slavery to sonship is described in Galatians 4^{4,5}; the second stage follows in verse 6. In the first stage we are carried back in thought to the purpose of the Incarnation. God sent his Son into the world that we might become sons instead of slaves. Therefore 'God sent forth his Son, born of woman, made subject to law'.¹ For our liberation it was necessary that the divine Son should become a human Son, and further that he should share, not only our nature, but also our state of bondage to law. He became a slave that we might become sons.² But there is an intermediate step. He became our fellow-slave under the yoke of the law, that he might ransom his fellow-slaves and so deliver them from that yoke. The picture drawn in verses 4 and 5 suggests a glad procession of emancipated slaves being taken from the

¹ Gal. 4⁴ as rendered by Burton, p. 216

² cp. Phil. 2⁷

slave-market to the home of their deliverer. Here he introduces them into his Father's house (cp. Rom. 5²); and there follows the formal act of adoption by which, one by one, they pass into full membership of the family, as brethren of the liberator and sons of his Father.

Now all this is actually described by St. Paul as the object which God had in view in sending his Son into the world. In verse 6 we have passed in one step from purpose to fulfilment with the words 'because ye are sons'. This rapid transition from purpose to achieved fact requires to be filled in with the full statement of 3²⁶⁻²⁹ a few lines earlier. There the transition from slavery to sonship is described as having taken place through baptism; and the point specially emphasized about the significance of baptism in these verses is that of our inclusion 'in Christ Jesus'. Thus our adoption to sonship was effected through our incorporation into the Son. In saying this we are, of course, making a composite picture out of two metaphors in Galatians, having in mind a third (that of grafting) in Romans 6.¹ Actually the illustration from adoption, as used here by St. Paul, emphasizes two ideas in particular; namely (i) that God has received us into a new relationship with himself, as sons in our Father's house; (ii) that he brought this about through the willing agency of his Son. The statement of this double truth in Galatians 4^{4,5} gives expression, in language of impressive simplicity, to the overwhelming fact of God's love for sinners. The Father was willing that we should in some sense share the privileges of his only Son. Moreover this willingness took effect through the gracious goodwill of the Son himself. For the Son not only desired that we should be fellow-heirs with him (Rom. 8¹⁷), but actually took the tremendous step of himself becoming partaker in our servitude with this end in view.

Once more we are reminded of the saying in Romans 8³²: 'He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not also with him freely give us all things?' And so he does, as Galatians 4⁶ proceeds to show. It is one thing for a slave to be adopted; it is quite another thing for him to

¹ The reader is at this point reminded of the argument about our inclusion in Christ developed at length by St. Paul in Gal. 3 and again in Rom. 4-6. See above, pp. 48-56. and also pp. 114, 117.

become in heart and character all that his new status actually implies. But God does not mock us. If he has brought us into the position of sons in his family, he has also taken corresponding steps to transform us spiritually, so that the inward reality of our lives may correspond to the objective fact accomplished. Now we know from explicit statements elsewhere that St. Paul attributes our new status as justified members of Christ's Body to the agency of the Holy Spirit.¹ If he does not mention this fact in Galatians 4⁶ it is because he had in his mind a different idea which was equally important and more germane to his argument. The Galatian Christians were in imminent danger of lapsing into Judaism. St. Paul's whole mind is bent upon showing them that this would be a return from sonship to slavery, and a contradiction of facts within the range of their own memory and experience. He had begun his appeal to them by asking: 'Received ye the Spirit on the ground of works of law or of a hearing of faith?' Their whole initiation into Christianity had been upon a basis of faith in Christ, not of dependence upon legal righteousness. On that basis they had originally received the Spirit from God in such an abundant supply that he had worked miracles among them and through them. 'Having begun with Spirit, are ye now finishing with flesh?'² In this passage, as in 4⁶, St. Paul is appealing to facts in their Christian life, which they could not deny, and which they must agree with him in tracing to the gift of the Spirit at their initiation. Now that gift was on a basis of faith, not of works (3²⁻⁵), of sonship, not of servitude (4⁶). Neither circumcision nor any other Mosaic condition had been laid upon them as the condition of receiving the Spirit.

Accordingly 'ye are all sons of God through the faith' (3²⁶). For 'those who are of faith, these are sons of Abraham' (3⁷) and therefore 'heirs according to promise' (3²⁹). Faith and sonship go together; but with them also goes the Spirit. For Christ ransomed us from slavery 'that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through the faith' (3¹⁴). So then 'because ye are sons, God sent forth the Spirit of his Son into our hearts' (4⁶). It is for St. Paul unthinkable that we should have the status and privileges of sons without having also that gift of the Spirit

¹ 1 Cor. 6¹¹, 12¹³, Rom. 5⁵

² Gal. 3²⁻⁵; cp. Burton *ad loc.*, pp. 147-152

which is described in 4⁶. These are, however, two different aspects of our sonship corresponding to the two aspects of grafting in Romans 6⁵. So far as our sonship is to be referred to the activity of the Spirit, we must say that the status won for us by Christ was made over to us by the agency of the Spirit.¹ We were made Christians by the Spirit. That was the first stage of the grafting process. It must be presupposed as the ground of the claim: 'ye are sons' (4^{6a}). But 4^{6b} refers to the second stage. For this there was required, not simply an activity of the Spirit, but an entry of the Spirit into our hearts. Through this entry of the Spirit there came an outpouring of God's love in our hearts,² and likewise a filial response from us to God. The whole of that wonderful meeting between the penitent son and his father, as described in our Lord's parable, takes place in our hearts as a result of the Spirit's entry. Not, however, that meeting only, but also all that followed it in the life-long union of father and son. Finally, if our sonship is the ground of the Spirit's entry into our hearts, it is also true that in the fruits of the Spirit's entry we have sure evidence of the fact of our sonship. That is the force of verse 7: 'So that thou art no longer a slave, but a son; and if a son, then also an heir through God.' The same conclusion is reached in Romans 8^{16, 17}. The interior witness of the Spirit corroborates with ever-renewed power our own conviction that God has made us his children, and that consequently all the vast implications of that fact for our future destiny are likewise assured.

In conclusion it is to be noticed that, as in Romans 5⁵, so also in Galatians 4⁶ pentecostal language is applied, to describe the effects of Christian initiation. The words of the risen Christ: 'Behold I *send forth*³ the promise of my Father upon you' (Luke 24⁴⁹) received their fulfilment when St. Peter was able

¹ 1 Cor. 6¹¹, 12^{13a}

² The gift of the Spirit in Rom. 5⁵ seems to include both stages. It is the ground of the outpouring of love and consequently of our undaunted hope. But the two stages are not to be thought of as in a merely temporal succession. In other words the construction of the sentence in Gal. 4⁶, which, as Burton rightly argues, is grammatically in terms of cause and effect, bears witness to the inadequacy of our temporally limited thought-sequences. What is here struggling to expression is more truly understood in terms, not of cause and effect, but of ground and consequence.

³ ἐξαποστέλλω

to say: 'Having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he *poured forth*¹ this which ye see and hear' (Acts 2³⁸). It can hardly be an accident that St. Paul uses one of these key-words in Galatians 4⁶ and the other in Romans 5⁵. It may be that the solemn repetition of the word rendered 'sent forth' in Galatians 4^{4,6} has behind it traditional utterances of our Lord such as that which is recorded in Luke 24⁴⁹, and that St. John's Gospel correctly preserves the same phraseology² in 17¹⁸ and 20²¹. It is clear, at all events, that St. Paul is making a deliberate parallel between the Mission of the Son in the Incarnation and a corresponding Mission of the Spirit. The reference to Pentecost is therefore at least implicit in verse 6. Yet, exactly as in Romans 5⁵, the pentecostal phrase is used to describe not the single Mission of the Spirit to the whole Church, but its individual application in successive Christian initiations. In these two texts the apostle is writing about the interior life of Christian souls and about their participation in God's love. Against the plausible arguments of judaizing opponents he had only one weapon which could be confidently relied upon not to break in his hands. It was simply this: his readers knew in their own experience the reality of their access to God in Christ. They knew this because of a twofold fact: God's love had been poured out in their hearts; God had come into their lives and had transformed them. That was an un-mistakeable certainty; and its counterpart was for them equally sure. They found a response to God's love welling up in their hearts, which was not of themselves. By no act of theirs they knew themselves to be sons at home with their Father.

¹ ἐξέχεεν

² ἀποστέλλω in both cases

CHAPTER V

PARTAKERS OF CHRIST'S VICTORY

It was suggested in the last chapter that St. Paul's twice repeated use of the phrase 'Abba, Father' is to be traced back to our Lord's prayer in the garden of Gethsemane. The first word preserved the actual utterance of our Lord. The second translated that utterance into the language common to all Christians in the first age. In Romans 8 the use of this expression is preceded by the statement that 'as many as are led by the Spirit of God, these are sons of God' (v. 14). A similar phrase is used by two evangelists in their accounts of our Lord's temptation:¹ 'Jesus, full of the Holy Spirit, . . . was led by the Spirit in the wilderness.'² This followed immediately upon his baptism, the opened heaven, the descent of the Spirit and the Voice acknowledging the Beloved Son. These incidents, like that of the prayer in Gethsemane, set before us the exemplar of sonship in which we are partakers. The Beloved Son, acknowledged by the Father, and full of the Spirit, is led by the Spirit into the testing of his sonship. So we are acknowledged by the Father as partakers in that same sonship. Accordingly he sent the Spirit of his Son into our hearts to evoke in us Christ's response to himself. As the Son 'full of the Holy Spirit, was led by the Spirit', so we, partaking of that fulness,³ are led by the Spirit. For that is the true life of sonship which we receive from the Son.

The remark about being 'led by the Spirit' is explained in the next sentence: 'For ye did not receive the spirit of slavery "so as to relapse into a state of fear",⁴ but ye received the Spirit of adoption.' Union with God's Son carries with it not only the status of sonship but also a gift of the Spirit corresponding to that status. The adopted slave has not simply been transported

¹ Matt. 4¹, Luke 4¹. As these two narratives go back to a common source, the phraseology may perhaps be traced to our Lord himself.

² Luke 4¹ ³ cp. John 1¹⁶

⁴ so SH; to which they add the comment: 'The candidate for baptism did not emerge from the terrors of the Law only to be thrown back into them again'

into a new family life. He has also been equipped with the resources for a spiritual transformation which that new life implies and requires. A relapse into slavish fear would be contrary to the new life of sonship, to which the gift of the Spirit corresponds. Those who are being led by the Spirit of God are living the life which is proper to God's sons. For 'if ye are led by the Spirit, ye are not under the law' (Gal. 5¹⁸). Sonship means freedom, not from law as such in its deeper ethical significance, but from conduct based upon conformity to a legal system such as that of Judaism. For conduct based upon such a system the Gospel has substituted a new law, 'the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus' which has delivered us 'from the law of sin and death'. This statement at the beginning of Romans 8 (v. 2) introduces in a fuller form the argument briefly outlined in Galatians 4⁴⁻⁷. In the enlarged statement the ideas set forth in Galatians 5¹⁶⁻²⁶ are also included. The leading thoughts can be further illustrated from Romans 6 and 7 and other Pauline passages.

The new form of the argument starts from the fundamental defect of the Law, its incapacity and weakness when confronted with the imperious demands of 'the flesh'. The Law could set forth a standard of righteousness; but it could not bend men's desires into conformity with that standard. Thus it revealed sin, but could provide no remedy. It brought to light 'the law of sin and death' without overcoming it. It disclosed to men the fact that they were slaves of sin without removing the burdens which the taskmaster imposed. Indeed, as St. Paul had shown by illustration from his own life (Rom. 7⁷⁻²⁵), it had actually added another burden, the heaviest of all,—the burden of a guilty conscience. To deliver us from this manifold slavery 'God, sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh and as an offering for sin, condemned sin in the flesh' (Rom. 8³). Sin was like a successful pleader in a law-court, claiming rights against us. The Law as judge had to give the case in Sin's favour. We had acknowledged Sin's mastery and become its slaves. We had no legal standing. The Law was obliged to give sentence that we belonged to Sin and must continue under its tyranny. The Law was powerless to condemn the tyrant.

But what the Law was incapable of doing God has done. For he sent his Son to take upon him the rôle of the sinner. This

our Lord did by taking to himself our nature,—that nature which in us is sinful. In him, however, it was sinless. So he appeared in court in the guise of sinners, although himself the sinless one. He came to plead our cause as though it were his own. He came to deal with Sin, and he did so successfully. For what he did caused the condemnation of Sin in the flesh. At this point the picture changes. The legal metaphor is beginning to prove inadequate. The Law could not identify itself with the sinner in his plea against Sin. But this is just what Christ could do, and did. He took our place and was willing to suffer the consequences. For he could deal with Sin only by making an act of expiation in our stead. He paid the cost of being our advocate by taking our place in the dock and making in his own person an 'act of redress'.¹ This involved his death as the price of our liberty. For he could deal with Sin only by becoming a sin-offering.² We had sinned 'in the flesh'; so he died in the flesh. Thereby God 'condemned sin in the flesh'. The ineffectual judge has now been altogether displaced. God took its place; and, through the death of his Son, took the whole of the proceedings into his own hands. The act of redress, involving death as an expiatory sacrifice, is not easily combined with the picture of the divine Judge condemning Sin in the law-court. St. Paul, however, never minds mixing his metaphors to help out the argument. This habit of his at least draws attention to the fact that no single human analogy is adequate to the mystery of our redemption by Christ.

When God displaced the ineffectual judge and by his Son's action 'condemned sin in the flesh', he did not abrogate the legitimate claim of the Law. For all that he did was designed to achieve the result that 'the requirement of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit'.³ St. Paul's teaching about the Law has two sides. He condemned its legalism, but valued its morality. Its commandment is 'holy, righteous, and good';⁴ but its legalism played into the hands of sin and handed us over to 'the law of sin and death'. On its legal side our connexion with the Law was ended

¹ Rom. 5¹⁸ (M)

² The phrase *περὶ ἀμαρτίας* (Rom. 8³) has in LXX the technical meaning 'sin-offering'; cp. 1 John 2³, 4¹⁰

³ Rom. 8⁴ (RV margin)

⁴ Rom. 7¹²

by the death of Christ; for we died with him.¹ This has two aspects. When a man dies his obligations to the Law cease; but liability for having transgressed the Law also ceases. Now our Lord put himself in the place of sinners under the Law. He thereby laid himself open to the assaults of sin² which sought to make him a transgressor. For he was 'in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin'.³ So when he died upon the Cross, the assault had finally failed. In this way he 'condemned sin in the flesh' by refusing to allow his life in the flesh as man to be made an instrument of sin. Having taken upon him 'the form of a slave' he became 'obedient even unto death, yea, the death of the cross'.⁴ This was the price he paid for refusing to be the slave of sin.

Now when Christ died upon the Cross, we also died.⁵ Accordingly we were baptized into his death. Our old self was then crucified with him.⁶ This had the effect of putting an end to our enslavement to sin; for 'he who died has been justified from sin'.⁷ For those who died with Christ both the legal claims of the Law and its liabilities came to an end. Thus we have been set free from the slavery of the Law, and also from its consequences, the slavery of sin and death. This double theme is worked out in Romans 6⁶⁻⁷ as a direct corollary of our union with Christ's death through baptism (6¹⁻⁵). It follows that

There is therefore now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus.

For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus made me free from the law of sin and death. (Rom. 8^{1, 2})

There are three points to be noted about this statement, which sums up and illustrates the whole argument of Romans 5¹²⁻⁸¹⁷: (i) In the first place we see here clearly the double conception of justification which runs through all that St. Paul wrote about redemption from sin. On the one hand 'there is no condemnation'. God has declared us 'not guilty'. We are reconciled to him. On the other hand we have been set free 'from the law

¹ Rom. 7¹⁻⁶

² Throughout the argument of Rom. 6⁶⁻⁸ sin is personified in turn as slave-owner, brigand, tempter, usurper, litigant

³ Heb. 4¹⁵

⁴ Phil. 2^{7, 8}; cp. Gal. 4⁴

⁵ 2 Cor. 5¹⁴

⁶ Rom. 6^{3, 6}; cp. Gal. 2²⁰

⁷ Rom. 6⁷; cp. 1 Pet. 4¹

of sin and death'. The verdict in our favour was made possible by a great act of liberation. Christ has triumphed over sin and death and rescued us from them. They were like brigand-chiefs who had captured us and put us into chains. These kidnappers had snatched us out of our father's home and taken us into the 'far country'. They had set us to feed their swine, and left us to eat the husks of the swine-food. No doubt they lured us, with fair promises, to go by our own choice. Yet none the less it was gangsters' work. As long as we remained in their clutches we were slaves and not sons; we were in the service of rebels, and therefore estranged from our true king. Only when the redeemer brought us back could we be pardoned for our rebellious conduct. (ii) Secondly the verdict by which we were pardoned takes effect through the fact that we are 'in Christ Jesus'. The great act of redress and liberation had to be implemented in baptism. For then we became identified with the liberator in all that he did and suffered for our sakes. In particular it was through our identification with Christ in his death that the claims of the brigand-chiefs became invalid. Then and only then could the chains be struck off from our hands and the declaration 'not guilty' be made. (iii) Now when this great transformation took place, when the freed slaves became sons once more 'in Christ Jesus', that was the moment when 'the law of the Spirit of life' began to work in us instead of 'the law of sin and death'. 'If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature' and this new creation is the work of the Holy Spirit. Thus the redeeming work of Christ reaches the individual 'in Christ Jesus' where 'the law of the Spirit of life' has sovereign authority, just as 'in Adam' that other 'law of sin and death' held sway.¹

It is characteristic of St. Paul's thought that he always seems to interpret the work of Christ 'for us', in the events of the gospel history, from within that order of life which the historical Christ created. It is because we are in Christ Jesus and know ourselves to have been set free from sin and its consequences, that we are able confidently to affirm that interpretation of the gospel story which is summarized in Romans 8³. We know the power of the Spirit as a power which brings life in place of death. This internal fact, therefore, corroborates for

¹ 1 Cor. 15²²

us the truth that God sent his Son into the world, and the further truth that the Son, so sent, conquered sin by what he did and suffered in our nature. The state of grace 'where we have our standing', to which 'we have got access' through Jesus Christ, has its *locus* in Christ himself. In him alone 'the law of the Spirit' operates, and therefore in us as his members. So those who 'are led by the Spirit of God' know themselves to be God's sons (8¹⁴). The status of sonship 'in Christ Jesus'¹ carries with it the entrance of the Spirit into our hearts;² and the presence of the Spirit in our hearts corroborates our own conviction that we are indeed God's children (8¹⁶).

When we were made Christians we did not 'receive the spirit of slavery again unto fear', but 'we received the Spirit of adoption' (8¹⁵).³ We did not pass from one form of enslavement with all the servile fear which it bred in us to yet another form of the same sort of tyranny. Doubtless the apostle loved to call himself a 'slave of Jesus Christ' (1¹). Moreover in Romans 6¹²⁻²³ he exhorted his readers to regard themselves still as slaves, transferred from one master to another, that is from Sin to Righteousness. But the righteousness of which he there speaks, which he also calls 'obedience unto righteousness' (v. 16), is the new righteousness of Christ, of which he had written that 'through the obedience of the one shall the many be made righteous' (5¹⁹). Moreover in the next verse (17) he offers thanks to God 'that, whereas ye were slaves of sin, ye became obedient from the heart to that pattern of teaching whereunto ye were delivered'.⁴ That pattern of teaching may perhaps have included something like the Christological hymn in Philip-
pians 2⁵⁻¹¹, a primitive 'rule of faith' which set forth the record of the obedience of Christ. In any case the new righteousness, unlike the old, was not embodied in a legal code. It had been revealed once for all in the human life-story of God's Son, who submitted himself obediently to the conditions of his incarnate life, as one who had taken 'the form of a slave' and was subjected to the Jewish Law.⁵ He obeyed that Law that we might

¹ Gal. 3²⁶² Gal. 4⁶³ Our sonship is neither transitory, nor an empty form; see pp. 127, 128 above⁴ RV margin; cp. M *ad loc.*: 'rendered whole-hearted obedience to what you were taught under the rule of faith'⁵ Phil. 2^{7, 8}, Gal. 4⁴

be set free from obeying it. To such a pattern of teaching the Roman Christians had rendered obedience 'from the heart'. They gave it their entire allegiance, just because it did not enslave them, but opened up to them the way of freedom. Set free from sin, they gladly passed over to the service of the new righteousness (Rom. 6¹⁸). St. Paul speaks of the new service in terms of slavery in order to bring home the fact that it meant belonging to their new master, body and soul, as his possession.

It was in this sense that he himself was 'the slave of Jesus Christ'. The pattern of righteousness, prefigured in the suffering Servant of the Lord (Isa. 53) and brought to actual realization by the incarnate Son, involves that complete donation of ourselves to God which is described in Romans 12^{1,2}. If the Son of God took the form of a slave in an obedience which knew no limits other than his Father's will, how reasonable, spiritual and utterly worshipful such an exemplar of service becomes for us as God's adopted sons! So we did not 'receive the spirit of slavery again unto fear', but 'we received the Spirit of adoption'. That service of God which is appointed for us is such as befits our status as sons. Now the English word 'service' may represent at least three quite different ideas: (i) For first there is the service rendered perforce by a slave or serf who belongs to his master. He obeys, because he must, without alternative. He serves with slavish fear. (ii) Secondly there is the service of the hired servant, who is in a contractual relation to his employer. He does not belong to the man who hires him. He serves by agreement for mutual profit, and for so long as both parties desire it. His choice is limited to accepting or ending the contract of service. He serves for gain. (iii) Lastly there is the worshipper or devotee who serves God. His service is essentially worship,¹ that is an offering made by man to his Creator. Now as a created being man belongs to God. He is, body and soul, wholly and completely in God's power. Such a thing could never be true of a slave's relation to his human master. Yet the worshipper's service is by its very nature the more reasonable. For it is at least a voluntary offering, whatever be its motives and whatever be the form of its outward expression. This third form of service may sink, how-

¹ So *λάτρεια* in Rom. 12¹, rendered 'service' by AV and RV, means 'worship'; cp. *M ad loc.*, and see above pp. 19-21

ever, to the level of the second form. A man may serve God for what he thinks he can get out of it, and only so long as he thinks it profitable. Such a degradation of religion to the contractual level is frequently condemned in the Old Testament. It was one factor, at least, in Israel's apostasy. The prophets constantly protested against it; for it was in contradiction of the fact that Israel was God's son.¹ Now the ideal of true service to God is set forth in the figure of the Servant of the Lord in the second Isaiah. Israel, God's son, is there declared to be his servant. The essence of the picture lies in the combination of two ideas. The Servant is on the one hand God's devoted instrument. He is a sword in God's hand or a polished shaft in his quiver.² On the other hand the service which he renders is of free choice, in the sense that he recognizes and accepts his vocation to serve. His will co-operates with God's will. He is a victim who wills his own sacrifice. Thus he conforms completely to the definition of worship outlined in Romans 12^{1,2}.

So our Lord, who is the Son, became the Servant for our sakes in order that we might become sons who offer the free and willing, but also utterly devoted, service of God's true servants. For this we received the Spirit, not of slavery, but of adoption, who is none other than the Spirit of God's Son.³ With grim humour St. Paul declares that the slave of Sin gets wages, as though he were a hired servant; but the wage is actually death!⁴ So the lost son hired himself out for service. Yet he got nothing but husks for food. It is characteristic of sin that it pays us in our own coin by a deadly law of consequences, which is also a law of diminishing returns; so that at last nothing is left but death and doom. To sow self-interest is to destroy the possibility of fruitful interests, and in the end to reap barrenness.⁵ The righteous Servant, on the other hand, shall not only be satisfied himself, but shall also justify many.⁶ Through the service of him who fulfilled that prophetic picture we have exchanged the wages of sin for the gift of God. We have escaped the clutches of death and have received instead 'eternal life in Christ Jesus our Lord' (Rom. 6²³). Our adoption is therefore a

¹ Exod. 4²², Hos. 11¹, Isa. 63¹⁶, Mal. 2¹⁰

² Isa. 49²

³ Rom. 8¹⁵, Gal. 4⁶

⁴ Rom. 6²³

⁵ Contrast 2 Cor. 9⁶⁻¹⁵, on which see pp. 28-30 above

⁶ Isa. 53¹¹

sheer act of grace; and this point is repeatedly emphasized in Romans 8 as the course of the argument develops.

In the first place God's gift of eternal life in Christ becomes effective in us through the Spirit. Our freedom from the dreadful law of sin's consequences is due to the fact that when we received the Spirit of adoption that law was superseded by another. The new law is called 'the law of the Spirit of the life in Christ Jesus'.¹ There was, however, nothing magical about this great change. It occurred at the moment of our grafting into Christ (6⁵). That moment was also the starting-point of a process which depends for its final issue upon our sustained response to and co-operation with the Spirit. It is this to which St. Paul refers, when he speaks of our walking by the Spirit, or according to the Spirit.² He also uses the expression: 'led by the Spirit' to indicate our conformity to the Spirit's guidance.³ Our responsibility to respond and to co-operate is made clear by the earnest moral appeals⁴ in Romans 6¹²⁻¹⁴ and again in 8^{12, 13}. There is always the terrible possibility that the man who has been renewed will so act as to undo God's work in him. If our sonship is God's gift, that gift can be abused and even lost. If the old self has been crucified and is therefore dying (6⁶), it still needs to be mortified (8¹³).⁵ So the Galatians were asked: 'Having begun with Spirit, are ye now finishing with flesh?'⁶ Moreover the apostle found it necessary to say to them: 'If we live by the Spirit, by the Spirit let us also walk.'⁷ Though we have become partakers of the Spirit in Christ, yet the desire of the flesh still remains in us. What the flesh desires is anti-thetic to what the Spirit desires; and so conflict arises, which can be ended only by the complete victory of either one or the other.⁸

In Romans 8⁴⁻⁹ a contrast is drawn between two classes of people, called respectively 'they that are after the flesh' and 'they that are after the Spirit'. It is clear from the conclusion in

¹ The definite articles throughout Rom 8² emphasize the details of the contrast between the two laws, all the details having been previously mentioned, especially in 6²³

² Gal. 5^{16, 25}, Rom. 8⁴

³ Gal. 5¹⁸, Rom. 8¹⁴

⁴ These appeals recur in every epistle

⁵ cp. Col. 3⁵. On the paradox of mortifying what is, from another point of view, already dead (Rom. 6^{7, 8}) see above, pp. 60, 61.

⁶ Gal. 3³

⁷ Gal. 5²⁵

⁸ Gal. 5¹⁷

verse 9 that the former class are unrenewed sinners, such as the Roman Christians once were, when they were slaves of Sin and received his wages (6¹⁷⁻²¹). It includes people such as some of the Corinthians were, before they washed themselves clean.¹ At the same time 'those who are in the flesh' (8⁸) are not necessarily sensualists. They are simply persons of Adam's fallen race who, as a class, fall outside the *koinonia*. As such they do not 'receive the things of the Spirit of God'.² Fallen humanity in its unredeemed state follows its own law. It has its own attitude of mind, which is hostile to God and incapable of submitting itself to the divine law. This attitude carries in it the seeds of a deadly disintegration. It is, thus, in complete contrast to the attitude of mind which we must attribute to the Spirit of God. For he is 'the Spirit of the life in Christ Jesus', who by liberating us from sin and death brings to us the peace of fellowship with God (8⁸).

With the second group ('they that are after the Spirit') St. Paul identifies his Christian readers. They are 'in the Spirit', because the Spirit of God dwells in them (v. 9). Their whole status as Christians with all its privileges depends upon this fact. As we saw in 1 Corinthians 3^{16,17}, this indwelling of the Spirit is in the community as a whole: 'Ye are God's temple.'³ Yet it is also true that the body of each individual Christian is a shrine of the Spirit.⁴ So here, the Spirit which dwells in Christ's Body dwells in each member of Christ. Several important corollaries of this doctrine are now stated:

If any man hath not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his. And if Christ is in you, the body is dead because of sin; but the spirit is life because of righteousness. But if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwelleth in you, he that raised up Christ Jesus from the dead shall quicken also your mortal bodies through his Spirit that dwelleth in you. (Rom. 8⁹⁻¹¹)

To be 'in the Spirit' is due to the fact that 'the Spirit of God dwells in you' (v. 9). The imagery is doubtless due to the fact that the word 'spirit' also means 'wind' or 'breath'. We are 'in the Spirit' as in the atmosphere. We breathe in the breath of God, as we breathe in the air around us. So we are in the Spirit, and the Spirit is in us. We recognize him as the source of the new life which is active within our souls. 'For the Spirit him-

¹ 1 Cor. 6¹¹

³ see above, p. 14

² 1 Cor. 2¹⁴

⁴ 1 Cor. 6¹⁹

self, whereby we cry, Abba, Father, bears witness with our spirit.¹

Now the Spirit of God is also the Spirit of Christ. He is the Spirit which rested upon the Messiah.² For he descended upon Jesus at his baptism, who thereafter returned from Jordan, 'full of the Holy Spirit', and was 'led by the Spirit'.³ Three modes of relationship between the Christ and the Spirit are here suggested, all of which are reproduced in the messianic community and its members. For the Spirit rests upon us, as the cloud covered the tabernacle and as the Glory covered the ark.⁴ The Spirit also dwells in us, and leads us.⁵ It follows that 'if any man hath not the Spirit of Christ he is none of his' (8⁹). For it is not possible to belong to the Messiah except by sharing in the Spirit with which the Messiah was endowed. In this passage all the great lines of Pauline thought meet. The contrast between 'flesh' and 'Spirit' (vv. 4-9, 12, 13) has affinity with the doctrine of the two wisdoms in 1 Corinthians 1-4. The main argument of Romans 5-8 is here connected with the teaching of Galatians 4⁴⁻⁷ and 2^{19, 20}. Most significant of all, perhaps, is the language used about Christ and the Spirit in verses 9-11 and the way in which a new phrase—'Christ in you'—is introduced in verse 10.

In verses 9 and 10 three ideas are introduced in quick succession: (i) the indwelling of the Spirit of God; (ii) the possession of the Spirit of Christ; (iii) the indwelling of Christ. Clearly all three phrases refer to the same interior facts of the Christian life. For they are treated as interchangeable terms, which may be used alternatively without need of explanation. The Spirit of God who dwells in us is the Spirit with which the Messiah was endowed. He is the Spirit of Christ in this sense. The ascended Christ poured him forth upon his community.⁶ We receive him only through Christ. As Jesus received the Spirit of God, so we received from Jesus what he received.⁷ By member-

¹ The alternative rendering of Rom. 8^{15, 16}. See above, p. 121, n. 1.

² Isa. 11², 61¹

³ Mark 1^{10, 11} and parallels; see also pp. 127, 128 above

⁴ 1 Pet. 4¹⁴; see pp. 37, 38 above

⁵ Rom. 8^{9, 11}, Gal. 4⁶, Acts 6⁵, 11²⁴. See also pp. 127, 128, and reff. there.

⁶ Acts 2³³

⁷ This is the other 'kind of parallelism' referred to above on p. 78 with n. 2

ship in the community upon which the ascended Lord poured out his Spirit, we partake of that Spirit. So we 'have the Spirit of Christ'. But further, if we have the Spirit of Christ, then Christ is in us. There is a parallel here between Romans 8¹⁰ and Romans 5⁵. As the love of God is in us through the gift of the Spirit, so Christ is in us through possession of his Spirit. As pentecostal language was used there about the love of God in us, so the language of indwelling is used here about Christ, although that language is normally used in reference to the Holy Spirit (vv. 9, 11).

It will be convenient at this point to turn to another epistle for fuller illustration of the ideas under consideration. In 2 Corinthians 1¹⁸⁻²² St. Paul affirms both the faithfulness of God and the unwavering character of his own preaching. But, as is often his habit, he introduces a doctrinal statement as an 'aside'. The statement begins at verse 19: 'The Son of this same faithful God, Christ Jesus, who was proclaimed among you by us'¹ . . . was not 'yes and no'—the divine 'yes' has at last sounded in him, for in him is the 'yes' that affirms all the promises of God. Hence it is through him that we affirm our 'amen' in worship, to the glory of God.² The meaning of these two verses is that the faithfulness of God has been manifested in his Son. In Jesus, as the Messiah, all the promises of God in the Old Testament have been fulfilled. This is expressed by saying that in Jesus God has at last said 'Yes' to his promises. Now we Christians are accustomed, in our worship, to say 'Amen' at the conclusion of prayer offered to God for his glory. Moreover this prayer is offered to God 'through Jesus Christ'; for through him we have access to the Father.³ So then Jesus, as the Christ, has a twofold mediatorial function. On the one hand in him is the 'Yes'; for in him God has affirmed the truth of his promises. They have all come true in the Christ. On the other hand we make our response to these promises, which have come true in him; and this response is also offered through him. In his Son God gives us all; through the Son we make our grateful reply to God. In this brief statement the whole argument of the Epistle to the Hebrews is already implicit.

¹ v. 19a as paraphrased by Plummer (ICC), *ad loc.*, p. 30

² vv. 19b, 20, following M

³ Rom. 5^{1,2}

The next two verses (21, 22) are best rendered as follows:

And it is God who causes us, yes, and you also, to be securely established in the life of his Anointed, and it is God who anointed us, and sealed us as his own, and gave us the presence of his Spirit in our hearts as an earnest and foretaste of future blessings.¹

The paraphrase brings out the fact that the title 'Messiah' or 'Christ' means 'the Anointed One'. In this passage St. Paul claims for himself and his fellow-Christians that they also were anointed by God. The three verbs, 'anointed', 'sealed', and 'gave', all refer to a definite occasion. They most probably refer to baptism with its accompanying rites and ceremonies.² The word rendered 'earnest' means a 'first instalment'. The metaphor is taken from payment by instalments. The Holy Spirit, as a 'first instalment' of Christian privileges and a 'foretaste of future blessings', was given to all Christians at their baptismal initiation. All the three expressions are used elsewhere with respect to Christians as such, and most probably with the same baptismal reference.³

It is best, therefore, to conclude that all the three terms under consideration refer to Christian baptism, each of them indicating a different aspect of the baptismal gift of the Spirit.⁴ We are concerned here only with the anointing. St. Paul's argument in this passage is somewhat as follows: It is God who confirms us his ministers, as well as you to whom we were sent, in his Anointed One. For you will recall the fact that we and you together have a share in that anointing which is the very meaning of our redeemer's title. He was anointed with the Spirit and so were we. Or rather we have been made partakers in that anointing which he received. 'The Christ' is the One who was anointed with the Spirit. When we were made Christians we became members of the Christ. We are in him, and share in his messianic life, with all that that life signifies. All the promises of God come true in the One whom God anointed

¹ Paraphrase by Plummer (*loc. cit.*)

² It is very unlikely that they should be confined to St. Paul and his fellow-missionaries (Silvanus and Timothy, v. 19)

³ Eph. 1¹³, 14, 4³⁰, 1 John 2²⁰, 27

⁴ For the liturgical application of these terms, cp. *Confirmation* (SPCK) vol. i, chs. 1 and 2 and similar literature, especially Brightman's essay in Swete's *Essays on the Early History of the Church and the Ministry*

with his Spirit. We share the fulfilled promises, because we share the anointing. The God who did all this has shown himself faithful. We can, therefore, believe that he will always confirm us in the life of his Anointed One. Moreover that life is one of worshipful response to God in grateful acknowledgement of his goodness to us and of homage to his glory.

It was only one who had been anointed with the Spirit for his office, who could bring the whole of the old covenant to its fulfilment.¹ This the apostolic Church believed to be true of Jesus; and they found a special significance in any passage of Scripture which could be related to this fact. It is not too much to say that the conception of the Lord's Anointed which came to its fulfilment in Jesus sums up the whole biblical revelation. It signifies truly the completely Christocentric character of the Bible as the record of God's special revelation to man. It signifies both the character and purpose of God as revealed to Israel and again the nature and destiny of man as historically embodied in Israel, God's son and servant.

It signifies, once more, that God has a purpose for man; that man is chosen and called to co-operate with that purpose; and again that man's destiny is fulfilled through the endowment of God's Spirit. Finally God's purpose for man comes true in God's appointed way. Under the old covenant he had many anointed agents. But in Jesus, his Anointed One, the whole pattern of that purpose is seen in its unity. Jesus is therefore the only perfect representative of God to man and of man to God. In him as the One Man, chosen and endowed, we all partake of God's electing grace and of those endowments of the Spirit which God has appointed for man. In him we see manhood perfectly fulfilled in the Spirit. In him we not only see, but also

¹ Our familiarity with the word 'Christ', used as a name rather than as a title of our Lord, obscures the truth which it signifies. In the O.T. kings, prophets and priests were anointed in consecration for their office as God's representatives. At their anointing the Spirit came upon them (1 Sam. 9¹⁶, 10^{1, 6, 10}, 16¹¹⁻¹³, 1 Kings 1^{34, 39}, 19^{15, 16}, 2 Kings 9¹⁻⁶, 11¹²; cp. Lev. 8^{2, 12}, 10⁷). 'Messianic' passages forecast an ideal king endowed with the Spirit's gifts (Isa. 11) or depict the Lord's anointed, as God's Son, reigning in righteousness (Ps. 2, 45, 72, 89); in him the promises are concentrated (2 Sam. 7, Ps. 72¹⁷, 89¹⁹⁻³⁷). In the N.T. 'the Messiah' is blended with the Spirit-anointed 'Servant'; cp. Isa. 42¹, 61.

possess, that treasure of endowed and fulfilled humanity for which we were created.

In the descriptions of our Lord's baptism in the gospels the Spirit descends upon him; and a voice from heaven designates him in language which has association both with the messianic king and with the Servant of the Lord.¹ In St. Luke's Gospel our Lord's ministry begins in the synagogue at Nazareth with the reading of Isaiah 61 and the declaration: 'To-day hath this scripture been fulfilled in your ears' (4²¹). In that passage Messiah and Servant are already blended into one. The primitive Christian community had no doubt that in Jesus all the promises had come true. The anointed Servant who had been 'wounded for our transgressions' now reigned as victorious king and priest. He is 'thy holy Servant Jesus, whom thou didst anoint'.² 'God anointed him with the Holy Ghost and with power.'³ All these associations provide a background for the language of Romans 8⁹. The Spirit of God dwells in us only because we are partakers of Christ. As members of the messianic community we have already an earnest and foretaste of the blessings which in the Old Testament are assigned to a future messianic kingdom. For those who believed that all the promises of God had been fulfilled in Jesus, and that his community comprised the true Israel, it followed that all the blessings assigned by prophecy to the New Age were already being realized in the Christian Church. Above all the promise of the Spirit had come to fulfilment.

Accordingly in Romans 8⁹ the first statement is: 'The Spirit of God dwelleth in you'. Joel's prophecy had come true. 'Ye shall know that I am in the midst of Israel, and that I am the Lord your God, and that there is none else.' Therefore 'I will pour out my Spirit'.⁴ For our conflict with the flesh (Rom. 8⁴⁻⁹) we have on our side all the resources of the one true God. We have within us nothing less than the Spirit of the God who made this promise and has kept it. But the Spirit who thus comes to us from God is the Spirit wherewith according to his promise God has anointed his Messiah. He is the Spirit through whose agency all the promises of the old covenant have been fulfilled

¹ Mark 1¹¹, Matt. 3¹⁷, Luke 3²²; cp. Ps. 2⁷, Isa. 42¹

² Acts 4²⁷; v. 26 identifies him with the messianic king

³ Acts 10⁴⁸

⁴ Joel 2^{27, 28}

in Jesus. We receive the Spirit, not as individuals, but as partakers of the Christ, as members of the One Man in whom the whole purpose of God has been fulfilled. It is in this sense that a man 'has' the Spirit of Christ. 'If any man hath not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his.' He belongs to the fallen race of Adam, not to the new creation in Christ. To partake of Christ and to partake of his Spirit are two sides of the same fact. It is 'the Spirit of his Son' whom God sent forth into our hearts, evoking in us the response which is in accordance with our sonship in Christ. Now Christ's sonship is messianic. But he fulfilled the sonship of the second Psalm in the higher way marked out in the vocation of the Servant.¹ In the garden of Gethsemane the cry of filial response was the cry of the anointed Servant. It was the utterance of one who 'being in the form of God . . . took the form of a slave . . . and became obedient' (Phil. 2⁶⁻⁸). This response he made in the power of the Holy Spirit with which he had been anointed. As partakers of the Spirit which he received we partake also in the holiness of his filial response, the response which was manifested and fulfilled in his Passion. For the Spirit of Christ is the Holy Spirit of God. The holiness of God was manifested once for all in the response of his Spirit-endowed Son, the response which the Son made to the Father in willing obedience unto death. So the Holy Spirit, as the Spirit of Christ, made us partakers in the holiness of Jesus Christ which is the holiness of his filial response. There is no other holiness which those who are in Christ can either need or receive.

To say that a Christian is one who has, or partakes of, the Spirit of Christ is the complement of that other truth that he is one who is 'in Christ'. Up to this point in the Epistle to the Romans (8⁹) our relationship to Jesus has been consistently described with two characteristic phrases, namely 'through Christ' and 'in Christ'.² But in Romans 8¹⁰ the phrase 'Christ in you' appears. This expression occurs nowhere else in this epistle. Equivalent expressions occur in Galatians 2²⁰ and 4¹⁸; also in 2 Corinthians 13⁵, in Colossians 1²⁷ and in Ephesians 3¹⁷. There are a few other passages in the Corinthian letters which

¹ Isa. 42¹; cp. Mark 1¹¹

² 1⁸, 3²⁴, 5^{1, 11, 17, 21}, 6^{11, 23}, 7^{4, 25}, 8^{1, 2}; cp. also 5^{18, 19}; and, besides, 'into Christ' (6³) and 'with Christ' (6⁶)

may be thought to imply similar conceptions.¹ This type of language, therefore, is not common in St. Paul by comparison with the very large number of passages which speak of our being 'in Christ'. Nevertheless the new phrase is introduced in 8¹⁰ as something which requires no explanation. It is assumed that where the Spirit of Christ is there also is Christ, just as in 1 Corinthians 2⁹⁻¹⁶ the fact of having received the Spirit of God carries with it the privilege that we are made partakers in Christ's thoughts. But although the phrase is new, what it signifies has already been taught in this epistle.

The connexion of thought becomes clear, if we consider as a whole the verse (8¹⁰) in which this new phrase occurs. Its language is terse to the point of obscurity. But there can be no doubt as to its meaning. It is in fact a condensed summary of the argument worked out in chapters 5^{12-6¹¹}. 'The body is dead because of sin; but the spirit is life because of righteousness' describes the situation which follows upon the condition: 'if Christ is in you.' The description summarizes the teaching given in Romans 5¹²⁻²¹; it means precisely the same thing. We may recall another summary of this same line of thought: 'As in Adam all die, so also in Christ shall all be made alive.'² That summary is as explicit as the present summary is obscure. Briefly, the sin referred to in Romans 8¹⁰ is Adam's sin; and the righteousness is the new righteousness of Christ, of which we are made partakers (5^{12-14, 17-19}). So 'if Christ be in you, the body is dead because of sin'. Notwithstanding our new relation to Christ, our previous history as members of Adam's fallen community is not altogether effaced. For Adam's sin brought death to all men. The outward symbol of this fact is the mortality of the body. The new creation does not reverse the law of physical death in this life. On the other hand 'the spirit is life because of righteousness'. For 'one man's act of redress issued in acquittal and life for all' (5¹⁸ M). Though we cannot escape the death of the body, yet 'through the obedience of the one shall the many be made righteous . . . that, as sin reigned in death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord' (5^{19b, 21}).

Assuming the above interpretation of the two phrases about 'sin' and 'righteousness' to be correct, we have now to explain

¹ 1 Cor. 2¹⁶, 6¹⁷, 2 Cor. 4^{10, 11}, 11¹⁰, 13³

² 1 Cor. 15²²

the new phrase: 'Christ in you', and to relate it to its context. The phrase is another terse summary; and it covers the teaching given in Romans 6⁵⁻¹¹. The verse which we are considering (8¹⁰) speaks of two streams of consequences,¹ the first flowing from sin to death and the second from righteousness to life. The sin of Adam leads to death; the righteousness of Christ leads to life. The body dies because we once belonged to Adam's community. The spirit² lives because we now belong to Christ's community. The law of each community passes from its head to its members, or from the whole to the parts. It follows that in a certain sense Adam is in the whole race of sinners, as well as they in him. The same is also true of Christ and the new race of which he is head. As we were 'in Adam',³ so also 'Adam' was in us by natural generation. In an important sense 'the old Adam' is still in all of us, notwithstanding the fact that we have been transferred from him to Christ. So also, as we are in Christ by baptism, for that very reason he is in us. This is made clear in Romans 6⁵⁻¹¹.

The truth that Christ is in us because we are in him is made clear by the illustration from grafting (6⁵). For we are 'in Christ', not as a pebble in a box, but as a branch in a tree.⁴ Now the branch which is grafted in becomes partaker in the life of the tree (11¹⁷). The act of grafting may, accordingly, be regarded from two points of view. As soon as the act itself has been completed, there results a new fact which is both immediate and obvious. The grafted branch is now 'in' the tree. That new fact, however, becomes at once the starting-point of a new stream of consequences. Sap begins to flow from the tree into the new branch. The new branch is still, and continues to be, this particular branch and no other. It does not lose its identity. Yet as soon as the act of grafting is complete, a new life begins to enter the branch. Just because the branch is 'in' the tree, the life of the tree is henceforth also 'in' the branch. It is more natural, however, to speak of the branch being in the tree than of the tree being in the branch. The former way of speaking is true in a more literal sense than the

¹ see above, pp. 58ff

² i.e. the human spirit

³ 1 Cor. 15²²

⁴ The metaphor of the holy tree was frequent in the O.T. See Hos. 14⁸, Isa. 5⁷, 6¹³, 11¹, Jer. 2²¹, 11¹⁶, Ezek. 15⁶, Ps. 80⁸⁻¹¹. It was used by our Lord in his parables; cp. Mark 4³⁰⁻³² and parallels, Luke 13⁶⁻⁹, John 15¹⁻⁸

latter. We express the second truth more frequently by saying that the sap or the life of the tree is in the branch. These facts correspond broadly to St. Paul's two ways of expressing the truth about our relation to Christ. Most frequently he speaks of our being in Christ, as the branch is in the tree. The corresponding truth that Christ is also in us is stated in a variety of ways. For this aspect of our union with Christ is many-sided. Frequently it is represented by reference to the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. For to those who are in Christ God supplies his Spirit;¹ and this is nothing else than a 'supply of the Spirit of Jesus Christ'.² There is however another language. To belong to Christ means to have the Spirit of Christ; but it also means to have 'Christ in you'.³

For as we were grafted into Christ through the agency of the Holy Spirit,⁴ so also by the creative power of the same Spirit working in us a transforming process takes place. As the life of the tree flows into the branch, so the life of Christ passes into us. For 'the Spirit giveth life';⁵ and 'the last Adam became a life-giving spirit'.⁶ Himself anointed with the Holy Spirit, he has poured out the Spirit upon his community,⁷ thus making one Body which is both himself and his people.⁸ Within the one Body, therefore, 'the law of the Spirit' is supreme. It 'brings the life which is in Christ Jesus';⁹ so that 'Christ is in you'. This applies to all 'them that are in Christ Jesus';¹⁰ so that in each one 'the spirit is life because of righteousness'.¹¹ In short, the righteousness of Christ avails for us and is also imparted to us,¹² so that our spirits are quickened with his life¹³ through the indwelling Spirit.¹⁴ So far the positive aspects of the process have been described in general terms. For details we must turn to Romans 6⁵⁻¹¹. The process illustrated by the act of grafting is distinct from and consequent upon the act itself. The process, also, is actually twofold; it is negative as well as positive. The positive process, whereby the branch is assimilated biologically to the tree, so as to become one with it in life, involves for the branch itself a loss, not indeed of identity, but of the old life

¹ Gal. 3⁵² Phil. 1¹⁹³ Rom. 8^{9, 10}⁴ 1 Cor. 12¹³⁵ 2 Cor. 3⁶; cp. John 6⁶³⁶ 1 Cor. 15⁴⁵⁷ Acts 2³³⁸ 1 Cor. 12^{12, 13, 27}⁹ Rom. 8² (M)¹⁰ Rom. 8¹¹¹ Rom. 8¹⁰¹² 1 Cor. 1³⁰¹³ Rom. 5¹⁰¹⁴ Eph. 3^{16, 17}

which characterized the tree from which it was taken. As in Romans 11, we must here ignore the possibilities of horticultural science, and ask, what is the double process which St. Paul actually has in mind? The branch came from the 'Adam' tree and was grafted into the 'Christ' tree. In order to become truly one with the 'Christ' tree it must lose the characteristics of the 'Adam' tree. This is boldly expressed in the difficult phrase 'we have become united by growth with the likeness of his death'. It seems better *not* to suppose that this really means 'united by growth with Christ in the likeness of his death'. The phrase should be taken literally. Through being grafted into Christ we have grown into the likeness of his death. We have, by a process of growth, been assimilated to 'the likeness of his death'. When this process is complete we shall be completely conformed to the likeness of Christ's death. We shall then be finally dead with him. But already we have been united by growth with that likeness. We are in principle as good as dead with him. For we know 'that our old self was crucified with him' (6^e).

The man who is crucified is dead to this earthly life, even though life still lingers in him as he hangs upon the cross. He will never more resume the old life. He has died to it; yet he still endures the pains of the dying process. He is both dead to the old life, and yet still dying under a process of continual mortification. This was the death which our Lord died in literal fact. In our case, however, what takes place is a 'likeness' of that death, not the literal and physical dying while nailed to a piece of wood. The one took place in the historical order. The other takes place in a mystical order. It would not, however, be sufficient to say simply that the historical event of our Lord's crucifixion was a dramatic representation in the outward order of that which takes place in us in a mystical and spiritual sense. For the death of Christ upon the Cross was, in the first place, a real enactment in history of God's victory over the powers of darkness. It was the appointed means whereby God 'condemned sin in the flesh'. Through his death our Lord fulfilled the Law's demand and became for ever exempt from its liabilities. Thus he nullified Sin's use of the Law as an instrument of temptation and as a means to enslavement.

This cosmic victory effected through literal crucifixion and

physical death is reproduced in us through our conformity to that crucifixion and death. It is reproduced, however, in our interior life through mystical union with Christ. Our old self was crucified with Christ (when the grafting took place), in order that 'the sinful body' might be reduced to a state of impotence, that we might no longer be in a state of slavery to sin (6⁶). The body is here regarded, not as sinful in itself, but as the seat of dispositions and tendencies which may be instrumental to sin. In human nature as shared by the community of Adam these dispositions and tendencies have become subject to the domain of sin. Sin has taken possession of the human organism, which properly belongs to God. This usurpation had reached such a point in St. Paul's case that his own personality seemed to him to be brushed aside by another occupant. He has left a vivid account of this terrible experience in Romans 7 (especially vv. 14-24). There is in him a conflict between his true self and refractory impulses which he cannot control. The real man is swept aside every time. The impulses are controlled by another, whom they must obey. 'So now it is no more I that do it, but sin which dwelleth in me. For I know that in me, that is, in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing' (vv. 17, 18). The first half of this confession is repeated like a doleful lament a few lines further on (v. 20). We are reminded of our Lord's little parable of the strong man in possession of a house, who can be dispossessed only by one stronger than he.¹

But 'once dead, a man is absolved from the claims of sin' (6⁷ M); and that is what happened, when the old self was crucified with Christ. So then 'if we died with Christ we believe that we shall also live with him' (v. 8). For we *did* die with him, when we were 'buried with him through baptism into death' (v. 4), and 'we, who died to sin, how shall we any longer live therein?' (v. 2). St. Paul insists on the fact that we died with Christ in baptism, because then 'the old self' was nailed to the Cross. That old self still lingers on in its crucified condition; but we are dead to it. *For we are not the old self, but the new creature.*² This aspect of the transformation is brought out most vividly in Galatians 2^{19, 20}, the passage which, perhaps, comes nearest in thought to Romans 6⁵⁻¹¹. In both passages emphasis is laid upon crucifixion with Christ as the means of our liberation from

¹ Mark 3²⁷² 2 Cor. 5¹⁷

slavery. But, whereas in Romans 6 it is the slavery of sin from which we are set free, in Galatians 2 it is the slavery of the Law which fills the picture. 'For I through the law died unto the law, that I might live unto God' (v. 19). St. Paul's experience of life under the Law made him realize the necessity of salvation from sin through a gospel which would set him free from the fetters of legalism. Through the Law he learnt to distrust legalism, and so was led to a radical change of attitude. The Law had become a master which had held his allegiance, and so had thwarted the unqualified surrender of his life to God.

The nearest parallel to this aspect of Galatians 2^{19, 20} is to be found in Romans 7⁴. Aversion from the Law's ineffectiveness could only prepare the way for a change. It could not of itself cause a man to die to the Law; still less could it enable him to 'live unto God'. 'Wherefore, my brethren, ye also were made dead to the law through the body of the Christ; that ye should be joined to another, even to him who was raised from the dead.'¹ Here the reference to the risen Christ fixes the meaning of the phrase 'the body of the Christ' in the preceding clause. Our deliverance was accomplished, not simply through the crucifixion, but through the crucified body of the Christ.² 'Marriage' to the Law (7¹⁻³) was, for us, ended by the death of Christ. For his death is ours; we died when he died upon the Cross.³ This took effect in each of us in baptism, when 'our old man was crucified with Christ' (6⁶). For we were then grafted into the organism of the Crucified Man. Our old self, then, is dead. But it was *this* self which was wedded to the Law. The 'marriage' has, therefore, come to an end. With the death of the old self *the Law died to us*. The new self is free (7¹⁻⁴).⁴

¹ Rom. 7¹⁻³ is a parable. The Christian Jew was married to 'the Law'; but is now 'dead' to the Law and joined to Christ.

² cp. K. Barth, *Romerbrief*, *ad loc.*, and on 12^{3-6a} (ed. 1926, pp. 215, 216, 429)—E.T. (Hoskyns) pp. 233, 234, 444; and M *ad loc.* (7⁴). 'We, the many, are one body in Christ' (Rom. 12⁵), Christ himself being the one Body to which we belong (1 Cor. 12¹²). See further below, Chapters IX and X.

³ 2 Cor. 5¹⁴

⁴ The key to the parable lies in the fact that the Christian soul ceases to be the old 'self' and becomes the new 'self'. When this takes place the Law dies as well as the old self. So when a man wakes from a 'nightmare', he has ceased to be the sleeper who dreamed; therefore the dream with its tyranny has ceased to exist.

Accordingly

I have been crucified with Christ; and it is no longer I that live,¹ but Christ liveth in me: and that life which I now live in the flesh I live in faith, the faith which is in the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself up for me. (Gal. 2²⁰)

The preceding verse indicated that the apostle's personal experience of life under the Law was a factor in his conversion. 'Through the law' a crisis was reached. There came a day when 'I through the law died unto the law, that I might live unto God' (v. 19). The explanation of that great event is to be found in the next phrase: 'I have been crucified with Christ.' The final result is expressed in the moving words: 'and live no longer I, but liveth in me Christ.'² The 'I' which lives no longer is the 'I' which had such a disillusioning experience of the Law on account of its ineffectiveness in the conflict with sin.³ It is this 'I' which lives no longer, having died to the Law through crucifixion with Christ. It is therefore to be identified with 'our old man' (Rom. 6⁸). It was well that this 'I' should die, so that it became 'no longer I'.⁴ For with identically the same phrase Romans 7 describes the terrible paralysis of this same 'I' in the twice-repeated refrain:

It is no longer I⁴ that do it, but sin which dwelleth in me.

(Rom. 7^{17, 20})

So in Galatians 2^{19, 20} we see a gradual retreat of the 'I' until it finally ceases to appear. This will become clearer to the English reader if a more literal rendering of the two verses is attempted, brackets indicating that the word 'I' does not appear in the Greek.

For *I* through the Law to the Law⁵ died, that to God [I] might live;

With Christ [I] have been crucified;

And live *no longer I*, but liveth in me Christ;

And the life that [I] now live in the flesh, in faith [I] live,

The faith which is in the Son of God who loved me and gave himself up for me.

¹ RV margin

² Burton's rendering

³ In v. 19 the *ἐγώ* coming first is emphatic. It describes his own experience gained through the Law. For the 'weakness' of the Law see Rom. 8³ and pp. 128, 129 above.

⁴ οὐκέτι ἐγώ (Gal. 2²⁰, Rom. 7^{17, 20})

⁵ νόμου νόμῳ without the articles. But in both cases the Mosaic Law as a system seems to be intended. So Burton *ad loc.*

In the Greek the word *ego* occurs only at the points where the 'I' is italicized. It will be seen that in the lines as printed above the 'I' occurs in an emphatic position at the beginning of the first clause, indicating the apostle's natural interest in and emphasis upon his pre-Christian experience. At that period his own achievements in keeping the Law were all-important. Salvation then depended upon his own works. But the staff upon which he leaned proved a broken reed and caused him to fall repeatedly. Eventually he had to cast it away as useless. In the second half of the first line there is a strong antithesis between the Law and God, and again between death and life. He had tried to 'live unto God' 'through the Law'; but this had actually given to the Law the central position which should have been given to God. He found that he was living for the sake of the Law instead of living for the sake of God. This is the nemesis of legalism. Law becomes an idol taking the place of God. For such a terrible blunder only a desperate remedy could suffice. Nothing short of dying to the Law would make it possible that God should return to the centre of the apostle's life,—'that to God [I] might live.' That was the object of his dying to the Law; and the very form in which it is stated shows what a revolution it involved. The 'I' which was so emphatically at the centre died. Its place at the centre, however, was taken, not by a new 'I', but by God.¹ The new life is centred in God and the 'I' appears 'no longer'. In the second line, also, it appears 'no longer'. Life unto God came through being crucified with Christ. The 'I' is now on the Cross with Christ; by that very fact it has been cancelled out.

In the second line all the emphasis lies upon Christ, as at the end of the first line it lies upon God. Just as death to the Law means life unto God (God taking the place of the Law), so crucifixion with Christ means that Christ crucified fills the picture, not the crucified self. We are not allowed to adopt a self-centred pose, even in our crucifixion. What matters now is not our 'consciousness' of being crucified, not even our own 'sense' of membership in the crucified Saviour.² Not even 'faith' has the primary place, although that receives due recognition towards the end of the verse. If God is to be at the centre, the only thing that matters at all is 'Christ crucified'. We are

¹ cp. p. 112 above

² see above pp. 83, 84

moving here in the same atmosphere as in the early chapters of 1 Corinthians, where 'I determined not to know anything among you, save Jesus Christ, and him crucified' (2²); where those who know him and recognise him as the crucified Messiah also know him as the Lord of the Glory, although crucified (2⁸). The reason for their attitude is that they received 'the Spirit which is from God' (2¹²) and consequently 'have the mind of Christ' so that they think his thoughts (2¹⁶). In thinking his thoughts, the thoughts of the crucified Lord of the Glory, they cease to think about themselves. They cease to think about their own wisdom or their own achievements. If they think the thoughts of the crucified Saviour they certainly think about God, about his realm of love, and about those whom he loves. So also they know themselves only as belonging to Christ, just as he knew himself only as belonging to God (3²³).

So the 'I' has been crucified; and therefore 'live no longer I'. At last it is plainly stated that the 'I', with which the whole passage began, lives 'no longer'. It has been implied twice over in the theocentric and Christocentric statements following the opening clause. Up to this point the meaning of the phrase 'I died to the Law' had not become clear. One may 'die' to a thing, that is, cease to have any further relations with it,—and yet be alive to other interests. So a man may be 'dead to the world' through absorption in reading or thought. Accordingly the meaning of the phrase depends altogether upon the nature of those other interests which are the real ground of this 'dying' or being 'dead'. A man could of course become dead to the Law through casting all morality behind him and giving himself wholly to a life of sin. Such a course, however, had no attractions for Saul the Pharisee, the stern and enthusiastic moralist, who had been able to say: 'I advanced in the Jews' religion beyond many of mine own age in my race, being more exceeding zealous for the traditions of my fathers' (Gal. 1¹⁴). Dying to the Law must, for such a man, be something wholly beyond his natural bent, like tearing the very heart out of himself or jumping out of his own skin. It must be something which he as the unrenewed man was totally unable to receive, in as much as it belonged to the things of the Spirit (1 Cor. 2¹⁴).

We see in Romans 7 how in his pre-Christian life St. Paul was essentially moral at heart. The whole meaning of the

tragedy described in the latter part of that chapter depends upon the fact that we are witnessing the struggle of a highly moral man. 'I delight in the law of God after the inward man' (v. 22) is a desperately sincere utterance which sums up his whole attitude. All the way through the struggle he insists that his will is on the side of goodness. That is precisely what perplexes him and baffles him. 'I cannot understand my own actions; I do not act as I desire to act; on the contrary I do what I detest' (v. 15 M). Will goes one way, actions another. All the time that this is happening 'I consent unto the law that it is good' (vv. 16, 22). He is unwavering on that one point. Yet this moral 'I' is paralysed. It is put out of action relentlessly. So that it is 'no longer I' that commit the act which I hate. It is 'sin which dwelleth in me' (vv. 17, 20). The final conclusion is stated at the end in terms of a complete antithesis (v. 25). This antithesis is brought out by the new fact of deliverance through Christ, for which a cry of grateful thanksgiving has just been uttered. Left to myself,¹ without the aid of Jesus Christ our Lord, I am in an intolerable state of contradiction. I am a slave to two lords, the law of God and the law of sin. With my conscience I acknowledge the lordship of the former; with my disordered passions and desires, I yield allegiance to the latter.²

'Left to myself'—here we see the whole root of the matter. The seat of the trouble is not really situated in the passions where sin seems to dwell. It is situated in the highly moral 'I' which is paralyzed; not in the rebellious crew, but in the captain of the ship, who is at the same time both weak and obstinate. The moral self is wholly inadequate to the moral standard; yet it obstinately persists in keeping up the pretence that it is competent for the task. The pride of false independence and self-sufficiency is the fountain-source of all sin. The consequence of this false self-sufficiency is seen in verse 23 where the rank and file are provoked to rebellion. They make a successful attack upon the captain, put him into fetters and lead him as a prisoner to their new master, Sin. They are not to be blamed. All the fault lies with the captain. Moreover the false façade of independence has been maintained only through the self-delusions of legalism. If we think we can of ourselves fulfil the

¹ αὐτὸς ἐγώ

² but for another suggestion see M and C. H. Dodd (M) on 7^{25b}

moral law, we are formalists at heart, who do not yet understand in what morality really consists. We have mistaken the letter for the spirit. That is the essence of formalism, and it has a destructive effect upon the soul by ministering to pride.¹

The remedy for this state of things lies in the crucifixion of 'our old man', which is none other than our moral self.² The weak and obstinate captain had to be altogether displaced by 'Jesus Christ our Lord'.³ His lordship puts an end to the struggle between the two rival lords. The strong man, Sin, is ejected by a stronger than he from the house which he had usurped.⁴ Once the weak owner has been set aside, the usurper can be dealt with. The usurped property, the seat of sin, becomes like a fortress put out of action.⁵ It can now be turned to its true use—namely to become a house of God. 'Ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, since the Spirit of God dwelleth in you. . . . But if Christ be in you . . . the spirit is life because of righteousness.'⁶ The human spirit is now truly alive through the indwelling of Christ. The crucifixion of the old 'I' with its false independence and self-centredness has made this possible. The soul's life is 'no longer I' but Christ living in me. There is here, however, no supersession of personality. Just the contrary. There *was* a real supersession of personality, when the man could never act as he wished; when the law of sin superseded the law of God which conscience approved. This situation came to an end through the crucifixion of the old self. When we were grafted into Christ a new self was born,—the new creature. So 'the life that [I] now live in the flesh, in faith [I] live'.⁷ In the renewed man the weak self-dependent 'I' has been replaced by the new creature,—not a master without self-control but a servant loyal to the control of Christ. 'For the love of the Messiah controls us.'⁸

Unlike a weak master a strong and loyal servant does not indulge in self-advertisement. So the 'I' disappears from the text. The life of the new creature is, however, a fully human life. Outwardly it is the same earthly life, lived 'in the flesh'.

¹ This false confidence is elsewhere contrasted with the true confidence 'through Christ towards God'; see 2 Cor. 3⁴⁻⁶

² Rom. 6⁸, Gal. 2²⁰

³ Rom. 7²⁵

⁴ Mark 3²⁷

⁵ Rom. 6⁶: *ἡμεῖς καταργηθῇ*

⁷ Gal. 2²⁰

⁸ 2 Cor. 5¹⁴

⁶ Rom. 8^{9, 10}

But inwardly it is lived in the sphere of faith. The old self was led captive by the forces of 'the flesh'.¹ But the new self lives in a sphere where the conflict between the inward and the outward, conscience and nature, is resolved into a new harmony. When the love of Christ is in control, the peace of Christ settles all disputes.² This is true in the *koinonia* of Christ's Body, just in so far as it is also true in the interior life, where 'Christ liveth in me'. For the horizontal relations of the *koinonia* depend upon the vertical relations. The fellowship of the members with one another in the peace of Christ depends upon the control of Christ's love over all, upon the communion of all with Christ as co-partners in a common life. That common life is the life which Christ lives in all the members, as he dwells in each of them. It involves, on their side, faith,—'the faith which is in the Son of God who loved me and gave himself up for me.'

With the disappearance of the 'I' as subject of experience and centre of interest there appears the 'me' as sphere of Christ's activity and object of his redeeming love.³ When we were grafted into Christ, the old self died *with* him and the new self was born *in* him. But these things happened, because then also Christ began to be formed in us.⁴ The life of Christ began to pass into us and to re-shape our life, as the life of the tree begins at once to pass into the grafted branch and to communicate its characteristic qualities. This, however, implies that the grafted branch is in some sense capable of receiving the new life from the tree. In the old self there was no such receptivity, because it was fast closed against the new life by its own false independence. It revolved in self-interest round its own resources. The inflow of Christ's life became possible, because through the gift of the Spirit the love of God has been poured out in us. These supernatural effects may and do take place in the soul, before conscious awareness supervenes in the recipient. As we have seen, salvation does not depend upon the activity of our consciousness.⁵ Nevertheless sooner or later love outpoured and

¹ Conversely the crucifixion of 'our old man' included also a crucifixion of 'the flesh' as well (Gal. 5²⁴)

² Col. 3¹⁵; cp. 2 Cor. 5¹⁴

³ So in the two verses (Gal. 2¹⁹, 20) there occur in the following order: ἐγώ, οὐκέτι ἐγώ, ἐν ἐμοί, με, ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ

⁴ Rom. 6⁸, 11, Gal. 4¹⁹

⁵ see pp. 83, 84 above

life given evoke the response of faith in the heart, unless indeed the gift be utterly rejected.

Now the love of God is revealed in 'the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ'. We know God's love through the gift of his Son; for the love of the Father is mirrored in the love of the Son. Accordingly the immediate object of our faith, in its response to God's love, is 'the Son of God who loved me and gave himself up for me' (Gal. 2²⁰). The immediate object of our faith is he who has made us¹ the direct objects of his love. The evidence of that love is the fact that he 'gave himself up' on our behalf.² In fact 'we know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ' because 'he was delivered up on account of our trespasses' as a lamb led to the slaughter.³ We know that grace as conveying to us a revelation of divine love; because the Lamb of God was also the Servant who freely 'gave himself up' in voluntary surrender, making his soul a sin-offering for our sakes. We know that grace, not through any achievements of our own, nor because of any experiences which we may have had. That is to say, our experiences are not the ground of our knowledge. Our knowledge of the grace is grounded in God himself and in what he has done. We know the Son of God, as the one who loved us and gave himself up for us, through the love of God poured out in our hearts and through the inflow of Christ's indwelling life. The knowledge so given furnishes the conditions under which 'faith in the Son of God' is first imparted to us, and then sustained in us.

This faith is the differentiating mark of the new creature in contrast to the old self. Living unto God (Gal. 2¹⁹)⁴ means living in utterly trustful dependence upon the Son of God and in grateful allegiance to him. This faith is illuminated by a knowledge of his grace, as it was originally created by grace in out-poured love. It is illuminated by the knowledge of God, given in the mission of his Son,—that Son who gave himself up to death, that we, sharing in his death, might become partakers with him in his life of sonship.

¹ με

² ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ

³ Rom. 4²⁵; cp. Isa. 53^{6,7,12} (LXX). Gal. 2²⁰ has the same literary echo in παραδόντος. See above, p. 55, n. 5, and reff. there given.

⁴ cp. Rom. 6¹⁰

CHAPTER VI

PARTAKERS OF CHRIST'S SONSHIP

Through the gift of the Spirit, when we were grafted into Christ, the love of God has been poured out in our hearts. The evidence of this is the internal witness of the Spirit in our hearts, responding to God's love revealed in Christ. The new life is one in which we live by faith in the Son of God. The object of our faith is he who died on Calvary and rose again. Our faith reaches back to the historic events and upwards to the exalted Lord. It can do both because we are in him and he is in us. We are in the Son; he is our sphere of life. The Son is in us; his sonship is the substance of our life. All this provides a basis for the statement of another writer about the *koinonia*. It is to be found in the First Epistle of St. John and its leading sentences run as follows:

That which we have seen and heard declare we unto you also, that ye also may have fellowship¹ with us: yea, and our fellowship¹ is with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ

If we say that we have fellowship¹ with him, and walk in the darkness, we lie, and do not the truth: but if we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship¹ one with another, and the blood of Jesus his Son cleanseth us from all sin. (1 John 1^{3,6,7})

The word *koinonia*, here rendered 'fellowship', occurs four times in this passage. Twice it refers to fellowship with God, and twice to fellowship with our fellow-Christians. This passage, then, contains the writer's considered explanation of the meaning to be assigned to the word in his interpretation of the Gospel. His opening statement in verse 3 takes us back first to the associations of Acts 2⁴² and then to the implications of 2 Corinthians 13¹⁴ and 1 Corinthians 1⁹. In the first of these three passages 'the *koinonia*' is joined closely to 'the teaching of the apostles'. So too the writer of 1 John begins with 'that which we have seen and heard'. He claims to be, in some sense, an apostolic witness, and he here associates himself with the original eye-witnesses of the gospel events. The *koinonia* depends upon the apostolic teaching about Jesus. For the common life of the

¹ κοινωνία

Church presupposes the messianic events upon which it is grounded. So the writer announces the substance of the apostolic witness 'concerning the word of life' (v. 1) to his readers. He does so in order that they may share with him and with the original witnesses that common life which Christians share upon the basis of the Gospel. The following sentence (v. 3b) has been well paraphrased in these words: 'Fellowship, I say; and remember that the fellowship of which we speak, and which we enjoy, is no less than fellowship with God and his Son.'¹ As in Acts 2⁴² the *koinonia* is associated with the teaching of the apostles, so here. But the statement goes further and makes the *koinonia* dependent, as in 1 Corinthians 1⁹ and 2 Corinthians 13¹⁴, upon the Persons of the Godhead. In its human aspect it is '*koinonia* with us', that is with the apostolic witnesses as represented by the writer.² It is to be noticed, however, that the significance of this emphasis upon 'fellowship with us' becomes clear, only when it is seen that the *koinonia* has a divine aspect, from which it derives its whole significance.

So the writer proceeds to explain. Verse 3b may, perhaps, be paraphrased somewhat as follows: 'Remember that this fellowship of which I am speaking, this common life in which we share and in which we invite you to participate, is no merely human fellowship. It is essentially a communion with God. For God has revealed himself as "the Father", who makes himself known to us through his Son Jesus Christ. Communion with the Father is possible only upon the basis of the human life and messianic mission of the Son.'³ Moreover communion with God means communion "with the Father and with his Son". Here we are confronted with the impossibility of translating the word *koinonia*. When we are thinking of the common life of Christians in its human aspect, and particularly in its external manifestations, 'fellowship' is a suitable and adequate rendering. For the word has associations with all forms of human social relationship. But for that very reason 'fellowship' does not suggest so forcibly the deeper possibilities of spiritual relationship between

¹ A. E. Brooke (ICC), p. 8

² Concerning this language see Brooke (*op. cit.*, p. 9) on ἡμεῖς in v. 4

³ Hence the full titles and the human name: 'his Son Jesus Christ.' Hence also the emphasis in vv. 1-3 upon the life manifested to human sense-experience.

persons. The more intimate forms of human fellowship rise to a level which is better expressed by the term 'communion'. We have fellowship with many, with whom, humanly speaking, we do not hold communion in this deeper sense.

Now the *koinonia* draws its fundamental character, not from the degree of spiritual intimacy to which we may attain with some of our fellow-Christians, but from communion with God. Just for this reason it is a *sanctorum communio*¹ in both of the meanings which have been associated with that clause of the Creed. We may properly be said to have communion with all our fellow-Christians, because all are consecrated persons (*sancti*). As consecrated persons we all participate in 'the holy things' (*sancta*) which are the things shared in the common life of the Church. Now doubtless *sanctorum communio*, in the sense of 'a common sharing in holy things', had special reference to the sacraments. In that meaning of the phrase the communion of Christians with one another is imperfectly manifested on account of the breaches in the visible unity of Christendom. Notwithstanding this, however, the human fellowship of those who 'profess and call themselves Christians' remains a reality across the frontiers of external division. For the essence of the *koinonia* does not lie in human fellowship alone, as something actually and visibly achieved.

The essence of the *koinonia* lies in the fact that communion between God and man exists in Christ. In other words the common life of Christians, concerning which this book is making enquiry, is a life shared by God with man and by man with God. It has its source in God; and he has taken steps to impart it to man. The life shared is God's life imparted to us through and in his Son. The divine *koinonia* is represented in the Johannine books as a communion between the Father and the Son. We can have communion with the Father only in the Son, through partaking of his sonship. Our *koinonia*, therefore, signifies what it does, because it is a *koinonia* 'with the Father and with his Son Jesus Christ'. The First Epistle of St. John closes with a summary statement of this truth, closely akin to its opening paragraph:

We know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we know him that is true, and we are in him

¹ ἁγίων κοινωνία

that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God and eternal life. (1 John 5²⁰)

To be in the Son is to be in the Father, whom the Son reveals. The true God is he whom we know in the Son, that is the Father; and he, the Father, is the fountain source of unfailing life of which we are partakers in the Son.

So then, the specifically Christian characteristics of the *koinonia*, as a human fellowship, depend wholly upon its essence, that is, upon the communion of man with God in Christ. For such communion human forms of spiritual intimacy provide an analogy, however inadequate. Upon the basis of a common nature men share with one another common objects of interest and common spiritual activities. Thus they share knowledge and are exercised in mutual self-giving, whereby each enriches the other. There is an interchange of giving and receiving. Thus each partakes of a whole to which each contributes, and without which each would be poorer. One common life is shared in personal relations; in this respect at least human fellowship interprets communion with God. Here also there is a personal giving and receiving for which man was made. Communion of man with God, however, is in contrast to the spiritual intimacies of human fellowship. For in the first place the relationship here involved is not upon equal terms. Though God be our Father, yet we approach him in worship and holy fear because he is also our Creator. Secondly the life shared in common is wholly imparted by God to man. Our part is one of grateful response to the divine self-giving. We are admitted to communion with God, not in virtue of what we are or do, but solely in virtue of his love and of his gracious willingness that it shall be so.

The grace of God sets all men upon the same footing in relation to God and to one another. The common life in the Church is, therefore, in contrast to all forms of spiritual intimacy and human fellowship which find their basis in special and particular mutual affinities. That life is thus grounded in an objective principle transcending human personality, which forbids the claim of personal characteristics and proclivities to count for everything. We are to love our fellow-Christians, not because of special spiritual affinities with them, whether through likeness or through difference. We are to love them

solely because God loves them, and because we and they are redeemed by Christ. But lastly, communion with God is possible for man, notwithstanding all the contrasts which distinguish it from human forms of fellowship. It is possible, in the first place, because God willed that it should be so, and because he made us for communion with himself. But secondly it is possible because the Son of God became man and became partaker of our nature. This he did that we might become partakers of his life as the Son. His life is the perfect filial life of response to the Father; and he has made this life accessible to us.

For 'we know that the Son of God has come'. He became the New Man in whom we are all included. So the sphere of our communion with God is in his Son. 'We are in him that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ'; that is, we dwell in the true God, because we are in his Son Jesus Christ. At this point both in 1³ and in 5²⁰ we might expect a reference to the Holy Spirit, more especially in view of the fact that St. Paul twice uses the phrase '*koinonia* of the (Holy) Spirit'.¹ Actually, however, the Holy Spirit is mentioned only six times in this epistle (3²⁴, 4², 4¹³, 5^{7,8}).² As in St. John's Gospel, attention is fixed upon the Father and the Son. It is possible that the false teachers were claiming a monopoly of the Spirit, a claim always difficult to cope with.³ The only objective tests possible are the two which the author applies, namely (i) the test of right faith in Jesus Christ (4²), and (ii) the test of a holy life (3⁷⁻¹²). But these two tests are linked together by a third which is internal to the Christian life. This is the witness of the Holy Spirit, which is available for all Christians; for all have received the Spirit (3^{23,24}).

Now the Holy Spirit bears witness to Jesus Christ and to the truth about him (4²). This must be so, because the Spirit is sent by the Father in the Son's name (John 14²⁶), and because it is his function to glorify the Son (John 16¹⁴). Here we must notice the important argument in 2¹⁸⁻²⁷, which refers to the internal witness of the Spirit. This is not apparent on the surface because the author refers, not to the Spirit, but to 'the anointing'. Here

¹ 2 Cor. 13¹⁴, Phil. 2¹

² following RV. Possibly 4⁸ should be included.

³ cp. the false prophets in the O.T., e.g. 1 Kings 22

he fastens upon the fundamental safeguard against all false teaching which masquerades as the voice of the Holy Spirit. The passage is parallel to that in 2 Corinthians 1¹⁸⁻²², which was examined in Chapter V¹ in connection with Romans 8^{9,10}. The author of 1 John agrees with St. Paul as to the significance of our Lord's title 'The Christ'. Whenever Jesus is called 'Christ', he is implicitly designated as 'he who was anointed with the Holy Spirit'. So actually in 1³ and similar passages the Holy Spirit is mentioned by implication. Now all Christians have received the messianic anointing. When we were made Christians we became partakers of the Anointed One, and therefore also of the Spirit with whom he was anointed. In him we received the Spirit's gifts of wisdom and understanding, counsel and knowledge.² So we 'all know' (2²⁰).³ The anointing is no longer confined to the few, as it was under the old covenant. It has been made common to all who have a share in the common life.⁴

In the following verses the author declares that right faith in God is bound up with the truth that Jesus is the Messiah. To confess the Son is to 'have' the Father. So 2 John declares that to 'abide' in 'the teaching of the Messiah' is to have the Father and the Son.⁵ This teaching was imparted to them at the time of their initiation (2²⁴). Their case was similar to that of the Thessalonians, who accepted the word which they heard in the apostolic message, 'not as the word of men, but, as it is in truth, the word of God, which also worketh in you that believe.'⁶ This teaching which they received had not changed since they first heard it.⁷ Moreover it pointed back to 'that which was from the beginning' (1¹). Here we see the development of the

¹ pp. 138ff above

² Isa. 11²

³ RV margin. This reading, which is the better attested, has also greater intrinsic probability. The other reading (RV text) would be an easy rhetorical platitude. 'Ye all know' (οἴδατε πάντες) at the end of the sentence corresponds to the emphatic καὶ ὑμεῖς at the beginning. In the crisis of the Last Hour every Christian is safeguarded by the anointing with its dower of spiritual gifts. For no less than four of these gifts equip us for the spiritual discernment necessary to the knowledge of the truth and its adequate safeguarding.

⁴ Brooke (*op. cit.*, p. 57) aptly quotes Luke 11¹³

⁵ v. 9; cp. John 8^{31, 32} on which see Chapter VIII below, pp. 248, 249

⁶ 1 Thess. 2¹³

⁷ The second ἀπ' ἀρχῆς is emphatic

idea that Christian tradition is a valuable protection against error. Every Christian knows what he has always been taught. It keeps him from being a prey to novelty. For it bears witness to that which has come down from the original eye-witnesses. Antiquity and consent have value in protecting the *koinonia*. So if the teaching 'abide in you, you also will abide in the Son and in the Father' (2²⁴).

Our Lord himself promised us eternal life¹ (2²⁵); and this life consists in communion with God. It has been laid open to us in Christ through the self-communicating character of God as eternal light and life; and we enter upon it through faith, and the knowledge of God in Christ which is made accessible to faith.² This knowledge is ours (v. 21). Those who have entered upon the Christian life were at the outset made partakers of the anointing. The messianic character abides in them. They need no other teacher than this. They are equipped with the true teaching of the Spirit, which is adequate to all their needs. Its truth is unchanging, and so is the power given to them to hold fast to it (v. 27). With our faith thus protected we are kept abiding in the Son. Moreover to abide in him is to partake of the life shared in common by God's family. For we are children of God, who share one life of love (2²⁹-3²).³ The study of this epistle tends to show that its whole message is contained implicitly in its first paragraph. That section (1¹⁻⁴) is in fact a prologue which has much in common with the prologue of St. John's Gospel. As John 1¹⁻¹⁸ relates the Incarnation to the 'beginning' of the first creation, so 1 John 1¹⁻⁴ relates the *koinonia* to the 'beginning' of the New Creation. As John 1¹⁴ connects the Incarnation with the glory of the Father and the Son, so 1 John 1³ connects the Church with the *koinonia* of the Father and the Son. From the former connexion issues a fulness of grace and truth of which 'we all received'. From the latter issues a fulness of joy (1⁴).⁴

Further development of this astounding doctrine is contained in the passage following the prologue (1 John 1^{5ff}). The author turns to the ethical implications of the common life. God is light and sin is darkness. These are two opposites between

¹ cp. John 4¹⁴, 10²⁸

² cp. John 17³

³ cp. 4⁷, 8 *et al.*

⁴ On the Johannine doctrine of the *κοινωνία* see further my book, *The Incarnate Lord*, especially pp. 348-360

which there can be no *koinonia*.¹ To walk 'in the darkness' is the antithesis of having '*koinonia* with the Father'. If we claim to have communion with God, whilst living in sin, not only is the claim false, but our whole life is an acted lie (v. 6). Communion with God is the correlative of 'walking in the light'. For 'God is light' (v. 5), and 'he is in the light' (v. 7). So to walk in the light is to walk with God;² in other words, it is to have communion with God. That is the implication of verses 5-7. It is not, however, actually stated; perhaps in contrast to the antinomian boast of verse 6. Something else is said, however, which is its correlative. 'If we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have communion one with another.' Clearly the human *koinonia* is the counterpart of the divine. Unlike the antinomians alluded to in verse 6, 'we' (the writer and his readers) do not boast about our communion with God. But neither do we doubt its reality. For those who walk in the light, communion with God and the common life of the Church are two aspects of one and the same reality. The divine *koinonia* is the ground and source of 'our *koinonia*' (v. 3) and imparts to it its special character. We are admitted to a share in God's life which is the communion of the Father and the Son.

To this shared life which is at once human and divine there belongs an all-important condition. It is expressed in the concluding words of verse 7: 'and the blood of Jesus his Son cleanseth us from all sin.' Redeemed sinners are brought into communion with the Father through the cleansing blood of Jesus. This cleansing, however, is represented here, not as a single event of the past, nor even as a repeated event. Both of these forms of statement would be true; but they are not employed here. The cleansing is represented in verse 7 as a constant and abiding factor in the *koinonia*. There are, therefore, three conditions laid down in verse 7, all of which are necessary aspects of our communion with God. They are (i) walking in the light, (ii) communion with one another, (iii) being cleansed from all sin by the blood of Jesus. This gives a fourfold conception of the *koinonia*. Its essence is communion of man with God in Christ. Its ethical condition is a sustained endeavour to conform our lives to the holy light of God's revelation. Its human correlative is communion with one another in the fellowship of

¹ as St. Paul declared in 2 Cor. 6¹⁴; see above, pp. 11-13 ² cp. Gen. 5²², ²⁴

the Church. Finally, since the Church is a fellowship of redeemed sinners, these three aspects of the *koinonia* continue to be possible only in virtue of the abiding fact that we are being cleansed from all sin by the blood of Jesus.

This fourfold definition of the common life receives further development in the epistle. Our communion with the Father depends upon the fact that we are in Christ. We are sons in the Son (5²⁰). In the Johannine writings, however, the title of 'Son' is reserved to the only-begotten Son. As partakers in his sonship we are called God's children¹ and 'such we are' (3¹). The word implies community of character with the Father through likeness to the Son. Now the Son is sinless, and 'was manifested to take away sins' (3⁵). Just so far, therefore, as a man abides in the sinless Son, he is kept from sin (3⁶; cp. 5¹⁸). The children reproduce the characteristics of the Father (3^{9,10}). But God is love; and love comes from God. So love of the brethren is an unfailing mark of God's children (4^{7,8}). Communion is a relationship which implies love, whether it refer to God or to man. Love (*agape*) is the fundamental characteristic of the common life, both in its divine and in its human aspects. Moreover the human form of the *koinonia* came into existence through the action of divine love:

Herein was the love of God manifested in us, that God hath sent his only-begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him. Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins.

(1 John 4^{9,10})

These words are closely parallel to Romans 5⁵⁻⁸. We know God's love through the mission of the Son and through his atoning sacrifice. That is our objective ground for believing that God is love. But, as in Romans 5⁵ so here, this objective reality was 'manifested in us'. It became something internal to our life so that we know it from the inside. The purpose for which the Son was sent is also stated in two ways. The ultimate purpose was 'that we might live through him'. This end was secured, however, through the expiatory sacrifice offered by the Son for our sins.² The common life of love, which has

¹ τέκνα

² cp. Gal. 4⁴⁻⁶, where also the purpose of the Son's mission is twofold: (1) to redeem us from the bondage of the law, (2) the adoption of sons

extended downwards from heaven to earth, is, in its human form, wholly dependent upon the mediation of the Son and upon the power of his sacrifice. The whole treatment of sin in chapter 1 is brought to a conclusion with the statement that, where sin has occurred in an individual Christian life, 'we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous, and he is the propitiation for our sins', and not only so, but 'for the whole world' (2¹, 2).

Our 'advocate with the Father' pleads like an elder brother¹ for wayward members of the family,—but not like the elder brother in the parable. For *he* made his own rectitude a ground of complaint against generosity to the offender. So the restoration of the lost son to communion with his father was made under protest from his brother. Here however Jesus, who shares our nature, intercedes for us. He stands before the Father as the anointed and righteous Servant, who offered his life in expiation for our sins.² He pleads for those who have failed in their daily task of adhering steadfastly to the *koinonia*,³ that they may be restored to communion with the Father. His plea is solidly grounded, and therefore effectual. The Father himself sent the Son on the mission which involved the act of expiation (4^{9,10}). The power and efficacy of that act avail, not only within the family, but also for the whole world without.

This picture is closely similar to that in Hebrews 9¹¹⁻¹⁴, where our High Priest enters the heavenly tabernacle to sprinkle his own blood. There, too, the blood of Jesus avails to 'cleanse our conscience from dead works to serve a living God'. The sacrifice pleaded in heaven takes effect upon earth in human hearts. In 1 John 1⁷ the cleansing power of the blood of Jesus is an abiding factor at work in those who walk in the light. Of this there is constant need; for our sharing in the common life has not rendered us immune from the attacks of sin. 'The old man', though crucified, must still be mortified, lest the mind of the flesh resume its ascendancy, and so the tyranny of sin be renewed. So St. Paul would have agreed with the statement in the next verse. It is false to say that sin has no longer any hold upon our nature (1⁸). Yet for all sins actually committed there is

¹ cp. Rom. 8³⁴, following 8²⁹

² Χριστὸν δίκαιον . . . ἱλασμόν . . . ; cp. Isa. 61¹, 53^{10,11}

³ Acts 2⁴²

a permanent remedy. For 'if we confess our sins, he is faithful and righteous to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness' (1⁹). The continual renewal of our share in the common life is grounded upon the faithfulness of God. He has demonstrated his justice¹ once for all on Calvary. He has made good all his promises in his Son.² Moreover, 'if we are faithless, he abideth faithful; for he cannot deny himself.'³ So he renews the demonstration of his justice over again every time that we confess our sins. He does so by forgiving our sins and cleansing us 'from all unrighteousness'.

The statements of the New Testament about propitiation and expiation, forgiveness and cleansing, supplement and interpret each other. On the one hand our sins are like a debt incurred. This is made clear in our Lord's parables of imprisonment for debt.⁴ The debt has been expiated by the guilt-offering of the Righteous Servant,⁵ 'whom God put forward as the means of propitiation by his blood to be received by faith.'⁶ So we are set free from our liability and dismissed from the debtor's court. With the remission of the debt there has also been removed the threat of the debtors' prison. With the discharge of our liability the prisoners' fetters and shackles are also struck off. So we go out from those gloomy surroundings to re-enter our Father's house. Forgiveness freely bestowed includes both remission of debt and release from captivity. One thing remains. The sacrificial blood of Jesus expiates our offence and thus puts an end to our captivity; but it also has power to remove the defiling stains of sin's uncleanness. Now 'he that is bathed needeth not save to wash his feet, but is clean every whit'.⁷ We washed ourselves clean once for all.⁸ Yet we have a daily task of striving to walk in the light. The soiling stains of this daily pilgrimage inevitably show themselves; there is, therefore, constant need of renewed cleansing. Confession and pardon must be repeated as often as occasion requires. With them there is continually renewed the process of cleansing from all unrighteousness.

God sent his Son 'that we might live through him'; and the new life flows from the Son's act of expiation.⁹ Through his

¹ Rom. 3²⁵, 26 (M)

² 2 Cor. 1¹⁸⁻²²

³ 2 Tim. 2¹³

⁴ Matt. 5²¹⁻²⁶, 18²¹⁻³⁵, Luke 12^{58, 59}, cp Luke 7³⁶⁻⁵⁰

⁵ Rom. 4²⁵, 1 John 2^{1, 2}

⁶ Rom. 3²⁵ (M)

⁷ John 13¹⁰

⁸ 1 Cor. 6¹¹

⁹ 1 John 4^{9, 10}

sacrificed life we are restored to communion with the Father. Only the man who denies that he has sinned is cut off from the benefits of the sacrifice (1¹⁰). For those who resort to its healing power there is a new life unto God.¹ 'If we died with Christ we believe that we shall also live with him'; and this life will be that very life which he now lives unto God. For we are to reckon ourselves 'alive unto God in Christ Jesus'.² Christ is our life;³ and he is in us.⁴ So in the life which we now live by faith in him⁵ the stream of his sacrificed life flows into us as a cleansing tide to purify our souls from all sin (1⁷). The cleansing stream is always operative in us, unless we clog the channels and so obstruct its flow.⁶ Forgiveness, then, carries with it the cleansing of the conscience.⁷ In the act of pardon the removal of guilt and the cleansing away of the stain are two aspects of one event. There remains, however, a more gradual process. Liberation from the bondage of sin involves a transformation of the servile heart into a filial heart. This is not accomplished in a day. So also the removal of defilement inaugurates a longer process of purification from wrong desires and motives, thoughts and habits.⁸ This is a work of time. Forgiveness is succeeded by this purifying process, which is to effect the transformation of the whole character; just as it is preceded by that process of repentance which the New Testament calls a change of mind (*metanoia*).

Thus the whole work of restoration is threefold, and at each of the three stages 'the blood of Jesus' occupies the centre of the picture. (i) For first of all it is the outpouring of his blood upon Calvary which 'manifests' God's love to the sinner.⁹ The blood spilt signifies the life outpoured in sacrificial libation¹⁰ before the Father. This sacrifice is a spectacle of divine love made manifest in human terms; having in it, therefore, the power of appealing to human hearts. It works upon the sinner's mind, and, evoking in it a response to love, changes his whole outlook. (ii) Secondly

¹ Gal. 2¹⁹² Rom. 6⁸⁻¹¹³ Col. 3⁴⁴ Rom. 8¹⁰, Gal. 2²⁰⁵ Gal. 2²⁰⁶ cp. Col. 2¹⁹, Eph. 4¹⁶, where the unity of the Body is maintained 'through every joint of the supply'⁷ Heb. 9¹⁴⁸ more adequately represented in the allegory of the Vine (John 15²)⁹ 1 John 4^{9, 10}; cp. 2^{5, 8}¹⁰ Isa. 53¹², Phil. 2^{7, 17}

the shedding of Christ's blood signifies the efficacy of his sacrificed life to expiate sin and therefore its power to remove it.¹ In him the whole cultus of the old covenant came to its fulfilment, in particular the ritual application of sacrificial blood whereby persons and objects were made holy. So under the new covenant we are bidden to 'draw near with a true heart in fulness of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience'.² Hearts are sprinkled with the blood of Jesus, the mediator of the new covenant; that is, with 'the blood of sprinkling which speaketh better than that of Abel'.³

So we were chosen by God for a life which has two aspects, namely 'obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus'.⁴ We are made partakers in Christ's obedience, the filial obedience of the Son to the Father, whereby the many shall be made righteous.⁵ This obedience is nothing less than the sacrificial libation of the soul 'unto death'.⁶ There can be no 'communion with the Father and with his Son Jesus Christ' except for those who 'walk in the light' along the path of this obedience. Repentance, itself an effect of grace, leads to this path. But the obedience in question is Christ's own obedience. We are made partakers in it through incorporation into him, and through sprinkling with his blood for the forgiveness of our sins. It is the 'obedience unto righteousness' manifested in Christ's life and death, to which we became 'slaves' through grafting into Christ.⁷ This obedience becomes possible for us only when 'the blood of Jesus his Son cleanseth us from all sin'.⁸ By partaking of the sacrificial life of Jesus we partake of his sonship, whose law is filial obedience to the Father.

(iii) So thirdly, every act of divine forgiveness, by cleansing our conscience from guilt and stain, cleanses it also from dead works with a view to the service of a living God.⁹ We die once

¹ Rom. 3²⁵, Heb. 2¹⁷, 9¹¹⁻²⁸, 1 John 2², 4¹⁰, 1 Pet. 1^{18,19}

² Heb. 10²²

³ Heb. 12²⁴; cp. 10¹⁹

⁴ 1 Pet. 1²

⁵ Rom. 5¹⁹

⁶ Phil. 2⁸; cp. reff. on p. 167 above under note 10. העֲרָה לְמִוְתָּ נִפְשׁוֹ
in Isa. 53¹² is reproduced in Phil. 2^{7,8} as ἐαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν . . . μέχρῃ
θανάτου. It is a pity that 'kenotic' speculations have ignored this point.
See J. H. Michael (M) *ad loc.*, pp. 90, 91, and the article, to which he
refers, in JTS (xii, pp. 461-463). See also below, pp. 328-330

⁷ Rom. 6¹⁶, on which see above, pp. 132 ff

⁸ 1 John 1⁷

⁹ Heb. 9¹⁴

more to sin that we may live to God.¹ This 'living unto God' is sacrificial; it is the new cultus of the Christian life. As it is offered to a living God,² so it requires the living sacrifice mentioned in Romans 12^{1, 2}, which constitutes our spiritual rite. In the Exodus from Egypt a rabble of slaves were set free from their bondage and transformed into 'a kingdom of priests and an holy nation'; so also has it been with us.³ Yet the parallel is qualified by a whole series of contrasts. With us, as with them, there took place a sprinkling of 'all the people' with the blood of the covenant. For us, also, it is true that 'apart from shedding of blood there is no remission'.⁴ There, however, all was symbolical, external, transitory. Here all is real and effectual, charged with present power and abiding significance. So too in 1 John the *koinonia* is inseparable from the abiding fact of our cleansing through the blood of Jesus. The *koinonia* is sacrificial; and, in its human aspect, it exists solely by virtue of the sacrificial life of Jesus circulating as the life-blood of that fellowship which St. Paul called the Body. By this, especially, we see that the *koinonia* is a new thing effecting in us a new creation. For the common life of the people of God was transformed by the death of Jesus, as surely as the very meaning of sacrifice was transformed by that event. This double transformation is strikingly set forth in the words of a declaration which has already been noticed in this chapter:

For if the blood of goats and bulls, and the ashes of a heifer sprinkling them that have been defiled,⁵ sanctify unto the cleanness of the flesh: how much more shall the blood of the Christ, who through eternal spirit offered himself without blemish unto God, cleanse our⁶ conscience from dead works to serve a living God.⁷ (Heb. 9^{13, 14})

Whether 'eternal spirit' here refers to the Holy Spirit or to the divine nature of the Messiah as God's Son⁸ cannot be certainly determined. This question, however, does not affect the main thought of the passage. The writer is explaining his

¹ Rom. 6¹¹

² Heb. 9¹⁴. λατρεύειν θεῷ ζῶντι

³ Exod. 19⁶, 1 Pet 2^{5, 9}

⁴ Heb. 9^{19, 22}

⁵ κεκοινωμένους

⁶ WH and RV margin

⁷ The article before 'Christ' in the Greek, and also its omission before 'eternal spirit' and 'living God' seem to be worth preserving. This is especially true of the second phrase, the meaning of which is so uncertain.

⁸ carefully defined by the author in 1¹⁻⁴

previous statement that Christ 'entered into the holies once for all, having obtained eternal redemption' (9¹²). The sacrifice of Christ had such efficacy because it has eternal significance and abiding power. This in turn is due to the fact that it was offered by the Messiah himself, God's Son, who in his own person was both priest and victim. The contrast made here is not between the external cultus of the Old Testament and a purely interior sacrifice of Christ in his spirit or through the Holy Spirit. The crucifixion was as much an external event as any animal-sacrifice. The writer, as he usually does, is here contrasting the temporal and the eternal. The old sacrifices were mere fleeting shadows in contrast to the archetypal sacrifice of the Messiah. They belonged to a covenant which has been superseded, as the 'old' by the 'new'. For 'that which is becoming old and waxeth aged is nigh unto vanishing away' (8¹³). The Messiah, on the other hand, offered himself 'through eternal spirit' without blemish unto God, 'in accordance with the power of an indissoluble life' (7¹⁶). His whole sacrificial action partook of the qualities and possessed the power which belong to eternal spirit. His sacrifice gave a new significance to history, just because in its own proper character it belongs to an eternal order of reality which will not pass away.

The purification of our sins was accomplished by God's only Son, the creator of the world and the heir of all things, who is the effulgence of the Father's glory and the express image of his substance (1¹⁻⁴). The Son's sacrifice, therefore, belongs to that eternal order in which there is *koinonia* between the Father and the Son. By this sacrifice our sins were purified; and so we are admitted through the veil 'into the holy place by the blood of Jesus' (10¹⁹). As that blood cleanses our whole nature, so also it transforms our status from that of outcast and estranged sinners to that of reconciled and consecrated persons who have access to God's presence. Hebrews 10¹⁹⁻²⁵ may be compared with Ephesians 2¹¹⁻²², and both with the doctrine of the *koinonia* in 1 John. In Ephesians the Gentile Christians are 'no more strangers and sojourners' in a land not theirs, but 'fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God'. In Christ Jesus they were 'made nigh by the blood of the Messiah'. He has reconciled Jew and Gentile together 'in one body unto God through the cross', so that 'through him we both have our access

in one Spirit to the Father'. In him together they form a living structure which grows into a holy temple of God. This living temple is provided with the living sacrifice of Romans 12^{1, 2}. Both belong to a living God, for whose worship we are prepared by a cleansing from dead works (Heb. 9¹⁴). In Hebrews 10^{19a} our access to God in the new worship is by a 'new and living way' through the rent veil of Christ's flesh.¹ The shadow-cultus is dead and the eternal sacrifice is the focus of a living fellowship.

But the fellowship is a worshipping congregation for this writer. For 'when others would say "fellowship" he says "worship"'.² The congregation of the redeemed are present with their High Priest in the Holy of Holies, their bodies washed in the waters of baptism and their consciences sprinkled with the blood of the divine priest-victim. They assemble in an attitude of faith and an activity of worship. As the Day approaches they hold firmly to their confession of the new hope in Christ; and their common worship passes into common acts of love (10²²⁻²⁵). This picture of Christian worship is the complement of the Johannine doctrine of communion with the Father and the Son in a human fellowship through the power of Christ's sacrifice. In both pictures the blood of Jesus is fundamental. In both the common life is transformed by the transforming sacrifice of God's Son. This transformation of what is common confronts us unexpectedly in the language of Hebrews 9¹³. That verse describes how the ashes of a dead heifer (mingled with water) were sprinkled upon persons who had suffered ceremonial defilement, with a view to their purification.³ The phrase rendered 'them that have been defiled' means literally: 'those who have been made common'. It recalls the fact that 'common' once meant 'profane' and unholy in contrast to the holiness of God, whereas in the New Testament this meaning becomes obsolete in the 'common life'.⁴

The Mosaic Law once served as a barrier protecting the people of God from pagan uncleanness and idolatry. Its principal defect lay in the fact that it could not keep out the troop of unclean spirits which eventually took possession of a spiritually empty house.⁵ For an empty house, even if cleaned

¹ see Moffatt (ICC) *ad loc.*, p. 143

² Moffatt, *op. cit.*, p. 125

³ Num. 19

⁴ see above, pp. 10-12, 17

⁵ Matt. 12⁴³⁻⁴⁵, Luke 11²⁴⁻²⁶

and fenced round, will eventually become infested with vermin. It needs an occupier; and in this parable the true occupier of the house is God himself. Now redeemed humanity is a temple in which God dwells.¹ For it is the messianic community which has the overshadowing cloud, the Glory of the Shekinah, and the indwelling Spirit.² Also it has the sprinkled blood of Jesus which cleanses us from all sin.³ Its law of consecration to holiness is one, not of external separation, but of internal transformation. The weak barriers of Judaism required a narrowly exclusive community; so the common was unclean. On the other hand the victorious power of Christ's sacrificed life penetrates the redeemed community and transforms its members from within with ever-renewed springs of purification. For redeemed humanity, therefore, there is no uncleanness but sin; and for that a cleansing fountain has been opened.⁴ By taking our nature and making it the instrument of victory over sin our Lord has cleansed our common humanity, thereby making all things common to be clean.

For the redemption of the life common to all men God has provided a Common Life which can meet the needs of all. The universality of the Gospel corresponds to the truth that our common humanity was made in God's image after his likeness.⁵ Yet this particular connexion is seldom made in Holy Scripture. Normally in the New Testament the universal offer of salvation is referred to God's love and mercy for a world of sinners rather than to our affinity with him by creation. The speech at Athens attributed to St. Paul (Acts 17²⁴⁻²⁹) stands alone in the emphasis which it places upon a 'natural' kinship of man with God. Such ideas were Greek in origin, not Jewish. Yet the New Testament shows a tendency of thought which has this very doctrine for its logical goal. This comes to the surface in 2 Peter 1⁴, which speaks of the promises granted unto us, 'that through these ye may become partakers⁶ of the divine nature.' The language used here must, however, be clearly distinguished from the speech in Acts. 2 Peter speaks of a participation in the divine nature which is ours, not by creation, but by grace. So too, the doctrine of the 'deification' of man, taught by the

¹ see above, pp. 12, 14, 15

² see above, pp. 163 ff

³ Gen. 1^{26, 27}

⁴ see above, pp. 37, 38

⁵ Zech. 13¹

⁶ *κοινωνοί*

Greek Fathers from the second century onwards, is entirely bound up with and dependent upon the doctrine of the Incarnation. It does no more than draw out the implications of the New Testament.¹ The teaching of Acts 17 is, however, a conclusion which follows inevitably. If God's Son took our human nature that we might share his divine nature, then God must have created us for this destiny. He must have created us with an affinity to himself. This is also implied in the fact that we were created in Christ.²

The Bible, as a whole, teaches that men are made God's sons by election and grace. The appeal of Malachi to his fellow-Jews: 'Have we not all one father? hath not one God created us?' is not based upon the bond of a common humanity, but upon 'the covenant of our fathers'.³ The claim of Israelites to be God's sons is traced back behind the Exodus.⁴ St. Paul, who gloried in our adoption through Christ,⁵ recognized an adoption under the old covenant. God had chosen Abraham and his seed in a line of descent through Isaac and Jacob.⁶ This sonship by election is of grace, not of works: 'that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works, but of him that calleth.'⁷ But for this very reason it cannot be restricted by any special claim to privilege. 'For this cause it is of faith, that it may be according to grace; to the end that the promise may be sure to all the seed.'⁸ The Gospel abolishes privilege; for all men are sinners redeemed by Christ. He is the Seed to whom alone privilege belongs by right. He is the Heir; but to all whom he has redeemed there is offered a share in his inheritance. He is the Son; but all men may have communion with the Father in him, if 'God sent forth the Spirit of his Son' into their hearts.

The doctrine that we are God's adopted sons by election and grace is stated in its most complete form at the beginning of the Epistle to the Ephesians. It is there made the theme of a thanksgiving in which 'the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ' is blessed for the blessings bestowed upon us in Christ:

Even as he chose us in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blemish before him: having

¹ cp. especially 1 John 3⁹: 'his seed abideth in him'; and the whole doctrine of the New Birth (see Chapter VII). But see also below, p. 403

² Col. 1¹⁶

³ Mal. 2¹⁰

⁴ Exod. 4²²

⁵ Gal. 4⁵

⁶ Rom. 9³⁻¹³

⁷ Rom. 9¹¹

⁸ Rom. 4¹⁶

in love foreordained us¹ unto adoption as sons through Jesus Christ unto himself, according to the good pleasure of his will, to the praise of the glory of his grace, which he freely bestowed upon us in the Beloved: in whom we have our redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of our trespasses, according to the riches of his grace, which he made to abound towards us in all wisdom and prudence, having made known unto us the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure which he purposed in him unto a dispensation of the fulness of the times, to sum up all things in Christ . . . in whom also we were made a heritage, having been foreordained according to the purpose of him who worketh all things after the counsel of his will; . . . in whom ye also . . . were sealed. . . . (Eph. 1³⁻¹⁴)

This statement spans all time. The single continuous sentence symbolizes the unrolling of a single scroll,—the scroll of God's gracious purpose towards man. That purpose had its beginning in the divine will before the world was founded. God chose us before he created us. Our sonship, therefore, does not here depend primarily upon the nature with which God endowed us. For 'God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham'.² God, indeed, expressed his gracious purpose by creating us in his own image. But our sonship depends wholly upon his predestinating love. This truth of the interweaving of purpose and love comes out clearly in the rendering adopted above.³ Secondly it is to be noticed that the purpose of God is described throughout in completely Christocentric terms. He is the 'Father of our Lord Jesus Christ', who blessed us 'in Christ' (v. 3). He chose us 'in him' before he founded the world (v. 4). In his love he ordained beforehand our adoption unto himself as his sons, planning that this adoption should take place 'through Jesus Christ'. All this was settled before the worlds began in accordance with the good pleasure of God's will (v. 5). The purpose of God was carried out 'in the beloved' Son (vv. 6, 7); and its final issue is 'to sum up all things in the Christ' (v. 10). In him too Jewish believers were chosen as God's portion⁴ (v. 11) and Gentile believers were sealed (v. 13).

¹ RV margin; cp. M: 'destining us in love to be his sons through Jesus Christ'

² Matt. 3⁹

³ connecting ἐν ἀγάπῃ with προορίσας in vv. 4, 5; cp. Abbott (ICC), p. 8

⁴ following JAR, *ad loc.*, pp. 34, 145, 146; so too MM, pp. 347², 348¹. Similarly the compound form in Acts 17⁴ is rendered by MM (p. 549¹):

Thirdly the plan was the expression of God's good pleasure¹ and his deliberate purpose (vv. 5, 9, 11) 'unto the praise of his glory' (vv. 6, 12, 14).

Each of these two ideas is repeated three times in slightly varying forms, like the refrain of a hymn. What issues from God's loving and gracious, yet holy and sovereign will is to redound in praises from men and all creation. Their theme will be his glory manifested in his gracious love. For his grace was seen to be a glorious grace, when it was bestowed upon us in his beloved Son (v. 6). The measure of God's love for his only Son was the measure of the generosity which he showed when he gave him up for our sakes.² Two points are now mentioned which further explain 'the glory of his grace'. These are (i) our redemption through Christ's blood, and (ii) the forgiveness of our trespasses. The mention of these two aspects of God's gracious action towards us immediately calls forth another description of the grace (v. 7). It is the glory of God's grace that it triumphed over our sins. 'The wealth of his grace', moreover, was shown in the fact that we were redeemed at a great price. This was nothing less than the outpouring unto death of the Son's life-blood. God gave his beloved Son completely and without stint. Moreover this was the return which God made to us for our trespasses against him. So our Lord said: 'Love your enemies that you may become sons of your Father which is in

'were allotted to.' The weight of the evidence appears to be against Dr. Moffatt here. Col. 1¹² gives the complementary truth. But the whole point of Eph. 1³⁻¹⁴ is God's choice of us 'to the praise of his glory'.

¹ *εὐδοκία* and its verb sometimes occupy a central position in N.T. theology. The verb occurs in a Greek version of Isa. 42¹ quoted in the three accounts of our Lord's baptism (Mark 1¹¹, Matt. 3¹⁷, Luke 3²²), more fully in Matt. 12^{18ff}, and in Matt. 17⁵. The noun occurs in Matt. 11²⁶ and Luke 10²¹ in a highly Christological context in reference to revelations made by our Lord to his disciples. The recipients of his teaching belonged to the *ἀνθρώποις εὐδοκίας* of the angelic song (Luke 2¹⁴), that is, 'the elect' who belong to the true Israel, i.e. the Servant (Isa. 42¹). This agrees with Eph. 1^{5, 9}, where the elect are adopted to a share in Christ's sonship. The gospel versions of Isa. 42¹ show a tendency to blend the Servant with the Beloved Son (cp. Eph. 1⁵⁻⁷). Finally in Col. 1^{13ff} the Beloved Son, who is Wisdom and Creator, is subject to an exercise of the Father's *εὐδοκία* which reaches from the depths of eternity to the final consummation (1^{19ff}); cp. also Gal. 1^{15, 16} and Phil. 2¹³.

² cp. Rom. 8³², John 3¹⁶

heaven,'¹ addressing himself to those who were 'sons' under the old covenant. 'For he is kind toward the unthankful and evil',² as his whole treatment of ungrateful Israel had shown throughout their history. 'He hath not dealt with us after our sins, nor rewarded us after our iniquities.'³ God shows his fatherly love by rendering good to us for all the evil that we have rendered unto him. If we conform ourselves to this standard, we shall become true sons of our heavenly Father. Our conduct will then correspond to the intimate relationship into which he has so graciously admitted us. Our Lord assumed this principle to hold good for his Jewish audience. Christians read the meaning of such words in their Saviour's Passion, which was the price of their forgiveness.

But, further, the grace which God 'lavished upon us' brought to us also 'complete insight and understanding' (vv. 8, 9, M). The love of God poured out in our hearts effects an illumination of the mind.⁴ This has two aspects. For first God made known to us the secret (*mysterion*) of his will, all that he had planned to do in Christ. But secondly he caused the wealth of his grace to overflow into us.⁵ God has laid open the secret of his love in Christ. The light has come. For the spiritually blind it is obscured; but the darkness cannot overcome it.⁶ The light, however, can and does transform the darkness. For 'whatever the light exposes becomes illuminated,—for anything that is illuminated turns into light' (5¹³ M). When men awake from the sleep of death, Christ will shine upon them (5¹⁴) and they will 'turn into light'.⁷ The Day of the Lord has dawned revealing what was hidden. Under the old covenant God said 'that he would dwell in the thick darkness'.⁸ Even so 'he revealed his secret to his servants the prophets'.⁹ But the secret was not made 'common'. Like the way into God's presence, it was confined to the few, until the veil of the temple was rent and access was freely granted. Now however the hidden God is 'the Father of the glory' (1¹⁷), who is revealed in his Son. The glory has

¹ Matt. 5^{44, 45}² Luke 6³⁵³ Ps. 103¹⁰⁴ see above, pp. 103 ff⁵ vv. 7-9; for *ἐπερίσσευσεν*, cp. 2 Cor 9⁸, 1⁵⁶ John 1⁸; see Bernard (ICC), *ad loc.*, pp. 5, 6⁷ in this life or the next; cp. 1 Thess. 5¹⁻¹⁰⁸ 1 Kings 8¹²⁹ Amos 3⁷; cp. Dan. 2²⁰⁻³⁰

appeared in the face of Jesus Christ, as the glory of the Messiah who is the image of the Father.¹ The secret of God's will is 'the secret of the Messiah', now revealed by the Spirit to Christian apostles and prophets (3^{4,5}).

The essence of the secret now laid open in Christ was this: 'that the Gentiles are fellow-heirs, and fellow-members of the body, and fellow-partakers² of the promise in Christ Jesus through the gospel' (3⁶). For a Jew this definition of the *mysterion* contained the whole Gospel implicitly. The admission of the Gentiles on equal terms without specifically Jewish conditions—that was the most amazing feature of God's secret. Nor must we overlook the implication which Jewish Christians saw so clearly. To admit the Gentiles on such terms was to transform the whole conception of 'the holy'. It was to mingle the profane and the consecrated. All existing notions upon this subject were upset. The Gentiles were 'sinners' *par excellence*.³ Thus the secret was pre-eminently 'the Messiah's secret' (3⁴). For the abolition of the old barriers was tolerable solely in the light of the redemption which Jesus actually brought as God's Messiah. The complete reversal of age-long prejudices was accomplished, because sin had at one and the same time been both completely exposed and completely defeated by Christ's victory. The argument of the Epistle to the Romans is simply a commentary upon 'the secret of the Messiah' so understood.

'The unsearchable riches of the Messiah' (3⁸) were alone adequate as a gospel for 'sinners of the Gentiles'. Their free admission was a marvel to which the miracle of divine forgiveness was a fitting counterpart. To feel the full force of such a text as 1 Corinthians 6¹¹ we should have to read the preceding list of sins (vv. 9, 10) with the eyes of a contemporary Christian Jew. When the terrible list has been set down the apostle breaks out with the cry: 'And such were some of you!' 'Some of you were once like that; but you washed yourselves clean, you were consecrated, you were justified in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ and in the Spirit of our God' (M). The *koinon* was consecrated through the *koinonia*; our common humanity was hallowed through the communion with the Father to which we have access in his Son.⁴ Such considerations lie behind the

¹ 2 Cor. 4^{4,6}; cp. Heb. 1³, John 1¹⁴

² Gal. 2¹⁵

³ συνμέτοχα

⁴ Eph. 2¹⁸, 3¹²

Epistle to the Ephesians. The union of Jew and Gentile through Christ's death 'into one new man in himself' (2¹⁵) carried with it a revelation of God's purpose in history.

That purpose which God prepared in Christ (1⁹), to be carried out in the fulness of the times, was nothing less than this: to sum up all creation in the Messiah (1¹⁰). The apostle, therefore, had a double mission: (1) 'to preach to the Gentiles the good news of the unsearchable wealth of the Messiah' (3⁸); and in so doing (2) 'to bring to light what is the dispensation of the secret', which from ages past had been 'hidden in the God who created all things' (3⁹). 'The unsearchable wealth' might be regarded from two points of view. In Colossians 1²⁷ the writer dwells upon its intensive depth. He there calls it 'the wealth of the glory of this secret in the Gentiles', and defines it as 'Christ in you, the hope of glory'. The possibilities suggested here are too deep for us to plumb.¹ Ephesians, however, has chiefly in view its universal range and extent (1¹⁰, 3¹⁸). The connexion between creation and Christ is implied in 3⁹⁻¹¹ and required by the key-word² in 1¹⁰. Creation was designed with a view to consummation in Christ. This is also explicitly stated in Colossians 1^{15, 16}. In these two epistles Christ's headship over the Church in the new creation is directly related to his functions as creator and consummator of the universe.³ The New Israel was no longer national; its scope was universal. The Messiah, likewise, had a significance which was universal and therefore cosmic.

So the secret was hidden in the past, that now might be made known the manifold⁴ wisdom of God. Moreover the Church of *Christus consummator* has cosmic functions as well. For the manifold wisdom is to be made known through the Church to all creation, including the angelic rulers and powers in the heavenly realms (3¹⁰). So the Church is the complement of the Messiah in his triumphant exaltation over all the spiritual principalities in the universe (1¹⁵⁻²¹⁰). The 'secret' was hidden from eternity in the Creator, to be disclosed now through the Church to creation. All this was in accordance with a purpose which God formed from eternity in the Messiah (3¹¹). There

¹ 'unfathomable' (Eph. 3⁸ M)

² ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι

³ cp. Col. 1¹⁵⁻²⁰, and see Chapter X below

⁴ 'very varied' (JAR)

follows a triumphant conclusion. He in whom God's eternal plan of creation exists, in whom it will hereafter be consummated, is none other than Jesus of Nazareth. He is the crucified Man whom in the Church we openly confess as Lord. In him we have confident access to the Father's presence through our faith in him (3^{11,12}). So the prisoner of Christ Jesus glories in afflictions endured as part of this great plan (3¹³).

'The unsearchable wealth of the Messiah' corresponds to 'the manifold wisdom of God'. The word here rendered 'unsearchable'¹ occurs in Romans 11³³ at the conclusion of St. Paul's theodicy for the rejection of Israel. 'Oh the depth of the wealth and wisdom and knowledge of God; how unsearchable² are his judgments and his ways beyond our power to trace.'³ The wealth of God's grace⁴ and of his wisdom and knowledge are beyond our power to fathom. They take us out of our depth. So we cannot explore his decisions exhaustively; for they are beyond our powers of comprehension. Consequently we cannot trace out the course which he is taking. 'For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways.'⁵ None the less God made 'the wealth of his grace' to overflow into us in all wisdom and understanding.⁶ These gifts come from 'the Spirit of wisdom and revelation', whom the apostle, in Ephesians, prays that 'the Father of the glory may give to you that the eyes of your heart may be enlightened' (1¹⁷).⁷ Having been sealed with the Holy Spirit of the Promise (1¹³), we have access to 'the secret of the Messiah'.⁸ For 'the Spirit searcheth⁹ all things, even the depths of God'.¹⁰

In a parallel passage the apostle prays to the Father 'that he would grant you, according to the wealth of his glory, to be strengthened with power through his Spirit in the inward man' (3¹⁴⁻¹⁶). This petition is made in order that 'the Messiah may dwell through faith in your hearts' (3¹⁷). Now Colossians 1²⁷ identifies 'the wealth of the glory of the secret' with 'Christ in you, the hope of glory'. To have the indwelling Christ is to have the glorious wealth of God's secret laid open in our hearts in all its depth and intensity. Thus filled with heavenly treasure

¹ ἀνεξίχνιαστον, lit. 'trackless'

² ἀνεξεραυνήτα

³ ἀνεξίχνιαστοι

⁴ so SH *ad loc.*, who compare Rom. 10¹²

⁵ Isa. 55⁸

⁶ Eph. 1⁷,⁸

⁷ cp. 3⁴, Col. 1⁹ and Isa. 11²

⁸ cp. Acts 2³³

⁹ ἐραυνᾷ; cp. Rom. 11³³

¹⁰ 1 Cor. 2¹⁰

they will be rooted and grounded firmly; and all this is to take place 'in love' (3¹⁷). For to have the indwelling Christ is to have the love of God in the heart,¹ creating in us the response of love to God and to the brethren.² The goal of the prayer now comes into view. It is 'that you may be strengthened' by God's secret laid open in the heart to grasp the extent and range of that same secret in its universal significance (3¹⁸). 'Christ in us' is the clue to all things 'in Christ'. The two forms of knowledge are, in fact, one. We cannot understand God's purpose in the world as summed up in Christ apart from understanding what Christ himself signifies. This we know best by knowing his love. Christ's love surpasses our capacity to know. That very fact, however, means that we know the love of Christ only by sheer donation of God's grace. To know Christ's love, therefore, means to be partakers in the divine life of self-giving. It is to have communion with the Father and the Son. Finally we are made partakers in this divine life of love for the purpose with which the prayer concludes. It is 'that ye may be filled unto all the fulness of God' (3¹⁹).

The prayer which we have been considering (3¹⁴⁻¹⁹) begins with the fatherhood of God and ends with 'the love of the Messiah which passeth knowledge'. The two are closely related, as is shown by the last clause of the prayer (v. 19*b*) and by the doxology which follows. Though the love passes knowledge we know that we have it, because it is 'the power which worketh in us'. For this very reason 'the glory' is ascribed 'in the church and in Christ Jesus' 'unto him that is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think' (vv. 20, 21).³ We know that God can so do, because his power is working in us. To have Christ in the heart is to know the love of the Father. Upon this truth the Pauline and the Johannine witness is one. So in Ephesians our access to God's love is the master-key both to the universal significance of the Christ and to the meaning of God's fatherhood. The two truths are inter-

¹ Rom. 5⁵, 8^{9,10}

² Rom. 8²⁸, 13^{eff}. Whichever way ἐν ἀγάπῃ be taken there is no substantial difference of meaning. The interpretation adopted here gives a meaning closely similar to that of ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ in Col. 2⁷.

³ The measure of this power was exemplified in the resurrection and exaltation of Christ (1¹⁹⁻²⁵)

woven all through the epistle. The Father chose us to be his adopted sons 'through Jesus Christ' (1⁵). Creation was designed to be summed up in the Christ in accordance with a purpose formed in him (1¹⁰, 3⁹⁻¹¹). So we received in the beloved Son grace, redemption and forgiveness in overflowing measure (1⁶⁻⁸). The Father showed his love for us when we were still dead in sins and 'by nature children of wrath' (2³), by quickening us with Christ to share his risen and ascended life (2¹⁻¹⁰). He showed his fatherly relation to all men when he admitted the Gentiles to the covenant through Christ's reconciling death. 'For through him we both have our access in one Spirit unto the Father' (2¹³⁻¹⁹).

'Every family', and so all fatherhood, derives its title from the fatherhood of God,¹ which is the ultimate fact underlying the pattern of creation (3^{14,15}). Finally there is 'one God and Father of all, who is over all, and through all, and in all' (4⁶). Even if this phrase refers primarily to believers, its ultimate scope must be universal. For God's fatherly relation to believers is in the Christ who is to sum up creation (1¹⁰) through the power of his resurrection, through his exaltation over the universe, and through his headship of the Church (1¹⁷⁻²⁶).² God's fatherhood cannot be narrower than his plan for creation in Christ. But if God is the Father of all men, their filial relation to him can be realized only through Christ. All were created by the Father for sonship in the Son.³ For this we were redeemed in the beloved Son (1^{6,7}).⁴ The consummation will be in terms of a sonship which has a significance as wide as creation. For 'the earnest expectation of the creation waiteth for the revealing of the sons of God'.⁵ The whole of nature strains in expectation to see the great event which will mark the crisis of our renovation.

The last quotation draws attention to the fact that our sonship cannot be completed until the final consummation of all things. Indeed a few sentences later St. Paul identifies the adoption of sons with 'the redemption of our body', that is to say, the final resurrection.⁶ The explanation is given in verse 29. To be God's sons means 'to be conformed to the image of his

¹ It is impossible to reproduce in English the reference of 'every family' (*πατριὰ*) back to a common origin in one 'Father' (*πατέρα*)

² cp. 3⁹⁻¹², 4¹³

³ Col. 1^{15,16}

⁴ cp. Col. 1^{13,14}

⁵ Rom. 8¹⁹

⁶ Rom. 8²³

Son'. This, however, cannot be completely effected until the resurrection, when the harvest of the new creation will be finally gathered in. Then will appear fully the transforming effects of that life which flows from 'the last Adam' who is a 'life-giving spirit'. Then only shall we 'bear the image of the heavenly', as partakers in the glory of 'the second man' who 'is from heaven'.¹ In that participated glory all creation will share. Sin has consequences which have penetrated the order of nature and distorted its true significance. As the fall of man brought in its train a curse upon nature,² so redemption will include, not only the resurrection of the body, but also a transformation of that created order to which the body belongs. So there is 'hope that the creation itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the liberty of the glory of the children of God'.³ The glory of the risen Christ will extend to and include the whole of creation. Not otherwise could there be fulfilment of God's purpose 'to sum up all things in the Christ, the things in the heavens and the things upon the earth'.⁴ Creation, then, is destined to share 'the glory of the children of God'. For this 'we know that the whole creation' is in pangs of travail up to the present hour.⁵ Creation is like a mother in child-birth awaiting the consummation of her motherhood in that new birth which will be the final regeneration.⁶ Such a regeneration could occur by no natural process.⁷ It will be nothing less than a 'restoration of all things'⁸ in Christ. This travailing of all creation has its counterpart in us.⁹ God's plan for creation awaits fulfilment in us. This truth explains the language used about adoption in Ephesians 1⁵. Our adoption to be God's sons was predestined 'before the foundation of the world' because it formed part of the plan of creation. Our place in the scheme was not an afterthought. Creation in the Son must find its consummation in the Son. This consummation is to take place through us. We, as the representatives of creation, are to be finally conformed to the image of the Son. That, indeed, appears to be one of the leading thoughts running through the argument of Romans 8¹⁹⁻³⁰. This passage is therefore a natural starting-point for the interpretation of Ephesians 1³⁻¹⁴.

¹ 1 Cor. 15⁴⁵⁻⁴⁹² Gen. 3¹⁶⁻¹⁹, Rom. 8²⁰³ Rom. 8²¹⁴ Eph. 1¹⁰⁵ Rom. 8²²⁶ Matt. 19²⁸⁷ cp. John 3⁴⁸ Acts 3²¹; but see below, p. 192, note 1⁹ Rom. 8²³

We must now turn our attention to the two verses in Romans 8 which connect the Holy Spirit with the resurrection. The first is verse 11.¹ The second is verse 23 which follows immediately upon the description of creation travailing with the birth-pangs of the New Age. It reads as follows:

And not only so, but ourselves also, which have the firstfruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for our adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body. (Rom. 8²³)

The word 'firstfruits',² here connected with the gift of the Spirit, is in 1 Corinthians 15²³ applied to the risen Christ. He is the firstfruits of the Easter harvest. The full ingathering will take place at the general resurrection, when we also shall rise again. For this we must wait. But we already have in Christ's resurrection a pledge to assure us that the wider harvest will eventually be reaped. Firstfruits also provide a sample, in this case the pattern sample or exemplar, of what the harvest will be like. Similar ideas are present in both the passages which we are considering (Rom. 8¹¹, ²³). The pledge of our resurrection, however, in Romans 8 is not, as in 1 Corinthians 15, the risen Christ, but the Holy Spirit.

In Romans 8¹¹ the indwelling of the Holy Spirit is declared to be a ground of assurance for believing that God will 'quicken also your mortal bodies through³ his Spirit that dwelleth in you'. A reason for this assurance is given. The Holy Spirit is 'the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead'. In other words, the God who gave us the Holy Spirit is the living God, the Lord of life and death. He conquered death in Jesus by raising him from the dead. He will assuredly do the same for us, because we have his Spirit dwelling in us. For, as was stated in verse 9, God's Spirit is the Spirit of Christ, that is, the Spirit with which Christ was anointed and which he, in turn, has poured forth upon us. The same power is at work in us as in Jesus Christ; for we are partakers in his Spirit-anointed humanity. If we have the Spirit bestowed by the risen Christ in accordance with the Father's promise, we have in that fact an assurance that we shall share completely in Christ's victory. Our 'mortal bodies' therefore, in which we already experience

¹ quoted above, p. 136

³ RV margin: 'because of'

² ἀπαρχήν

his quickening power, will be quickened as his was. Our victory over death will be manifested in the body, as was the case with him.

It will be noticed that there are two further implications of this argument in verse 11. We are told that the God who raised Jesus Christ from the dead will also raise us in like manner in virtue of the fact that God's Spirit dwells within us. This implies that the Holy Spirit, being the Spirit of the anointed Messiah, will produce in the messianic community effects which were produced in the Messiah. The law of the messianic life is one in Christ and in his people. This law includes both death and resurrection. If we are led by the Spirit we have part in both. As God's sons we are partakers both in Christ's sufferings and in his glory.¹ Secondly the form of the argument in verse 11 also implies the truth which underlies the teaching of 1 Corinthians 15; the truth, namely, that there is an analogy between Christ's resurrection and ours. In other words it is implied here, as in 1 Corinthians, that our Lord's resurrection was the exemplar or archetype to which ours will be conformed. The analogy does not, indeed, extend to all particulars. In Romans 8¹¹, however, it clearly includes two fundamental points. In the first place the God who raised up Jesus from the dead will also raise us. Secondly, as in his case, so in ours, resurrection means the quickening of the mortal body.

In verse 17 we are told (as in Galatians 4⁷) that as adopted sons we are co-heirs with Christ of the promised inheritance. There is however a condition attached to this privilege. The beloved Son suffered death when he came to claim his inheritance.² So also we, before we finally share with him in the inheritance, must first be fellow-partakers with him in his sufferings. These sufferings, which belong to 'this present time', are not comparable to the glory which shall be revealed (8¹⁸). None the less, they are a necessary prelude, forming part of those birth-pangs of the New Age in which all creation shares. So we also have our share with creation as a whole in that sighing and groaning which must precede the full glory of the risen life (8²³). At this point, for the second time, a connexion

¹ This point is explicitly stated in the following verses (12-17) and is presupposed in what follows, from v. 18 onwards

² Mark 12⁷

is made in this chapter between the gift of the Spirit and the resurrection of the body. Having the firstfruits of the Spirit we groan, 'waiting for our adoption, to wit the redemption of our body.'

The apostle and his readers shared the firstfruits of the Spirit, that first instalment of the gift, which was poured out in such a rich supply upon the primitive Christian community from the day of Pentecost onwards. This pentecostal gift of which they were all partakers was, however, only a beginning. The supply of the Spirit already received, with all its accompanying graces, was a pledge of yet more wonderful blessings to follow in God's final harvest-day. It infected them, therefore, with a nostalgia for the greater glory yet to be revealed. Having the firstfruits they had a sample of the future harvest. They had a key which opened a door into heaven. They looked forward with an eager longing, because they already had a glimpse of things to come.

In Ephesians 1^{13,14} Christians are told that they were, in their baptismal initiation, stamped with the divine seal, inasmuch as they then received the promised gift of the Spirit. On becoming part of God's property, they on their part received a first instalment (an 'earnest') of their inheritance as God's adopted sons. Thus their age-long destiny in and through Christ was brought a stage nearer to its fulfilment. God had, by affixing his seal to them, claimed them as his own. This was a definite pledge that one day his work of redemption in them would be completed. For they now belonged to his 'peculiar people', his 'peculiar treasure', which he had set apart as his own.¹ For such a possession no aspect of God's redeeming work could be left unfinished.² All must redound to the praise of his glory. In Romans 8¹¹ the indwelling of the Holy Spirit is a pledge of our resurrection; a ground of assurance, moreover, that the resurrection of the body will be in our case what it was in 'Christ the firstfruits'. In Ephesians 1^{13,14} the gift of the Spirit is both pledge and foretaste of our full inheritance; that

¹ cp. 'his inheritance in the saints' (v. 18) which in v. 14b is called his 'possession'. For *περιποίησις* and kindred words see Exod. 19⁵, Mal. 3¹⁷, 1 Pet. 2⁹; and cp. Isa. 43²¹ (LXX), Acts 20²⁸

² MM suggest (p. 508¹) that *ἀπολύτρωσιν τῆς περιποιήσεως* means: 'God's buying back of his ownership after its alienation'

is to say, it is a first instalment of that redemption which God will one day complete, and a pledge that it actually will be completed. In Romans 8²³ the gift of the Spirit which we now have is the firstfruits of our final redemption. It is, therefore, a pledge that redemption will in its fulness include the resurrection of the body (compare 8¹¹ with 8^{23b}). But it is also, as firstfruits, a pattern sample or first instalment of our completed redemption. Thus the veil is lifted upon the vista of our full sonship. So we learn that without the glorified body of the resurrection neither our redemption nor God's possession of us to be his peculiar treasure can be complete. For we became his peculiar treasure when he adopted us to be his sons; and the fulness of that sonship, for which we wait, will be manifested in an order of life where soul and body are re-united. Then, and not before, our conformation to the image of his Son will be complete.¹

We have now before us in all its stages God's plan for the adoption of sons. It began in the divine foreknowledge. For before he laid the foundations of the world God knew the goal towards which his creation would move, the glory of sonship in which it would be consummated. But 'whom he foreknew, he also foreordained'². Before the worlds were made he 'predestined us unto adoption as sons through Jesus Christ unto himself'.³ He himself chose us to be his own portion, the objects of his love, his peculiar treasure.⁴ All of this was settled millenniums before we were actually created. In the light of this doctrine of predestinating grace it is not, after all, so surprising that St. Paul should in one passage assign the same status to Jews and Gentiles before they became Christians as well as afterwards,⁵ likening both alike to children 'under guardians and stewards', heirs who have not yet become inheritors. For both alike were predestined to become sons by adoption. What is already willed by God exists in the divine mind and may be said, therefore, to have a certain degree of reality. Our status as sons, however, was finally secured by the mission of the Son and by his payment of the ransom-price which restored us to liberty.⁶ 'Whom he foreordained, them he

¹ see above, pp. 181, 182

² Rom. 8²⁹

³ Eph. 1⁵

⁴ Eph. 1^{4, 11, 12, 14}

⁵ Gal. 4¹⁻⁵; see above, pp. 115, 116

⁶ Gal. 4^{4, 5}

also called: and whom he called, them he also justified.¹ So at length we received the title-deeds of our adoption when we 'put on Christ' and were 'sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise'.² Then the life of sonship actually began in each of us. But this again was only the new beginning; for 'whom he justified, them he also glorified'.¹ 'We were saved in hope.'³ We have a new life, based upon the 'God of hope'⁴ and manifesting hope. So we wait with endurance for the final glory of sonship to be manifested in the risen life.⁵

¹ Rom. 8³⁰

² Rom. 8^{24, 25}

³ Gal. 3^{26, 27}, 4⁶, Eph. 1¹³, 4³⁰, 2 Cor. 1²²

⁴ Rom. 15¹³

⁵ Rom. 8^{18, 21, 23, 25}

CHAPTER VII

THE NEW BIRTH

The Christian doctrine of a new life stands in contrast to the contemporary Jewish expectation of a new world. Doubtless the two doctrines overlap in the New Testament. But the relation between them might be not inappropriately described in terms of kernel and husk. Within the sheltering husk or shell of Jewish apocalyptic expectations there appeared first the gospel revelation and then the pentecostal gift of the Spirit and the new life in Christ. Between kernel and shell, however, there was from the first a vital connexion. To this relationship the historical tradition of Christianity has remained true. The outward frame of eschatology has never fallen off completely from the transmuted and realized eschatology of the Christian life. It would be true to say that the new life has transformed its outward frame without getting rid of it. The husk or shell has been re-made by the new kernel to suit its own needs. Other illustrations may be useful here. Some living organisms shed their old skin and grow a new one. Others are able to transform their whole appearance or their outward frame or state to suit a new kind of life. Something took place in primitive Christianity which has points of correspondence with each of these biological changes. At the end of the New Testament period, for example, Christians continued to 'look for a new heaven and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness' (2 Pet. 3¹³). But their manner of looking for it had been profoundly changed by characteristic features of the new life.

This change is well illustrated by the passage which was under consideration in the closing pages of the last chapter (Rom. 8¹¹⁻³⁰). There St. Paul looks forward to a goal in which all creation will have been transformed in accordance with Jewish expectation. Yet the manner in which the expected change is connected with and made dependent upon the new life in Christ is deeply significant. For one thing the new order is no longer regarded as a wholly future event. Although the new world is not yet manifested, its birth-throes have already

begun. For the Messiah has come and has set the process in motion. The last act of God is already here; it was inaugurated in the person of God's Son. Its signs are not simply outward portents; yet one external sign is attested as the foundation of the transformed Christian expectation, namely the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead.

The resurrection of our Lord is, in the apostolic witness, the sign of the new creation. It is regarded as the pledge and foretaste of the final transformation which is yet to come. But it is also regarded as the foundation of the new life. 'He rose again for our justification' (Rom. 4²⁵). By that very fact, however, the resurrection of Christ connects the new life in a new way with the final transformation. Not only was the kernel new; but its connexion with its outward shell of eschatology was of a new type. A convert to Judaism was accounted to be a new-born child or a new creature. But St. Paul's use of this conception has a significance, by comparison with which its Jewish meaning is completely overshadowed. For the new creature of Judaism simply remained part of the old creation, in no present and vital relationship to the expected new world. We have to recognize that in the New Testament as a whole there has taken place a radical change in the doctrine of re-birth. According to Matthew 19²⁸ our Lord taught his disciples to look forward to 'the regeneration¹ when the Son of man shall sit on the throne of his glory'. It would seem, therefore, that he had in mind the biblical teaching about a new heaven and a new earth.² Moreover he associated this conception with that of the glorified Son of Man. The significance of this connexion lies in the fact that in his own teaching the Son of Man was to reach his glory through humiliation and suffering.

The regeneration, therefore, was in our Lord's thought linked with his own Passion, to which it was to be a sequel. For believers, from the first, it would be closely connected both with the Cross and with the Resurrection. Romans 5-8 may be

¹ *παλιγγενεσία*. For the literary associations of this word see MM, p. 476¹ and KTW, vol. i, pp. 685 ff. The parallel passage (Luke 22²⁸⁻³⁰ = Matt. 19²⁸) is placed at the Last Supper, and therefore speaks, not of the re-birth of the world, but of the messianic banquet, which will be the centre of that new world; cp. Luke 22¹⁵⁻¹⁸

² Isa. 65^{17ff}, 66²²

regarded as a commentary upon this connexion of thought as interpreted within the apostolic experience of the new life in Christ. By baptism we are united to the crucified and risen Messiah. We are therefore new creatures in a sense never true of converts to Judaism. Being united with Christ's death and justified through his resurrection we have passed into a new life which already belongs to the future regeneration of the world. We are members of the glorified Son of Man, and therefore in one sense the promise of Matthew 19²⁸ has already come true. As the later epistles make clear, we are already risen with Christ and seated with him in the heavenly realm.¹ Indeed this throws light upon the promised enthronization of the Twelve. Whatever their special prerogatives may be, they are in any case the princes of an enthroned community.

It is, therefore, not at all surprising that the word 'regeneration' should have come to be connected with baptism. Whatever other influences may have been at work, its use in this connexion in Titus 3⁵ is wholly congruous with the teaching of the New Testament as a whole.² By baptism we were made partakers in Christ. The old life has died and the new life has begun. This new life belongs to the 'age to come'. The two texts which speak of 'regeneration',³ therefore, mark appropriately the starting-point and the goal of God's act of new creation in the sphere of the Christian life. God 'saved us through the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost, which he poured out upon us richly, through Jesus Christ our Saviour' (Titus 3^{5, 6}).⁴ The new creation of the messianic community as a whole had its historical inauguration in the event of Pentecost. Through baptism the individual is placed within that event. He is there taken into the eschatological crisis⁵ of re-birth, whereby the people of God were once for all renewed. The descent of the Spirit at Pentecost was that event whereby the new life of the risen Christ was precipitated into his community.

¹ Col. 3¹, Eph. 2⁸

² The whole passage (Titus 3⁴⁻⁷) is quoted above on p. 86

³ Matt. 19²⁸, Titus 3⁵

⁴ On the significance of ἐξέχειν (v. 6) see above, pp. 85-87

⁵ cp. C. H. Dodd, *History and the Gospel*, p. 163, where this language is applied to the Eucharist

By sharing the outpoured Spirit they were re-born in Christ. They partook of the new life which is his life; but also that fact constituted a renewal of their nature effected by the Holy Spirit. The commentators encourage us to take the word 'washing' as governing both 'regeneration' and 'renewal'. The two words therefore may be understood as representing two aspects of the same event.

Behind the baptismal meaning of the text in Titus lies the pentecostal event to which the phrase 'poured out' refers. The original 'washing' was that of the Upper Room in which the Church of God was re-born and renewed. The one organism which is the Christ there entered into full possession of its many members. Baptism is an extension of this original 'washing'. For in baptism the neophyte becomes partaker in that final 'regeneration when the Son of man shall sit on the throne of his glory'. Moreover not only is his nature renewed by partaking of the Spirit. His baptism is also a renewal of Pentecost, in the sense that the pentecostal outpouring of the Spirit is renewed in him. At every Christian initiation the eschatological crisis enters the individual life of the neophyte. Because he is in Christ, Christ is also in him. Pentecost was for the Church the dawn of the eschatological regeneration which belongs to the Last Day. In every baptism therefore starting-point and goal are one. The Last Day began to dawn for each of us on the first day of our life in Christ. At the moment when we die with Christ we are already risen and ascended with him. The two texts, which, in form, refer respectively to the starting-point and the goal of the Christian life, also refer from another point of view to two aspects of the same event.¹

The washing of regeneration spans the whole Christian life. For the renewed life has the earnest of the Spirit which is a foretaste of glory.² So too the dawn of that glory is here. For the rays of the final 'regeneration' (Matt. 19²⁸) reach back like great beams of light to the starting-point of our life in Christ, and indeed beyond it to the upper room of Pentecost. Further evidence of this truth is afforded by the peculiar language of an early passage in Acts. The passage in question belongs to the

¹ Titus 3⁵ refers primarily to the starting-point, and Matt. 19²⁸ to the goal

² see above, pp. 183-186

apostolic sermon which followed upon the healing of the lame man at the gate of the temple. It runs thus:

Repent ye therefore, and turn again, that your sins may be blotted out, that so there may come seasons of refreshing from the presence of the Lord; and that he may send the Christ who hath been appointed for you, even Jesus: whom the heaven must receive until the times of restoration of all things, whereof God spake by the mouth of his holy prophets which have been since the world began.¹ (Acts 3¹⁹⁻²¹)

There is a parallel between this exhortation to repentance on eschatological grounds and the exhortation in which the sermon of the preceding chapter culminates. Both are ascribed to St. Peter. It is probable therefore that the author of Acts held them to be mutually consistent in their teaching.

Now the sermon in Acts 2 connects repentance with baptism (v. 38). That in Acts 3 connects repentance with 'the times of the restoration of all things' (vv. 19-21). In both sermons St. Peter charges his audience with the sin of having murdered the Messiah. It is of this sin, therefore, that they are to repent. Moreover the repentance connected with baptism in 2³⁸ is as truly eschatological as the repentance called for in 3¹⁹. This will be clear, if attention is paid to the argument of 2¹⁴⁻³⁹. In Joel's prophecy, with which the sermon begins, the outpouring of the Spirit is the immediate prelude to the Day of the Lord. It belongs to the last days, as the sermon says. Although the passage quoted does not expressly say so,² the context shows that the

¹ Tr. LC contains the following: 'Repent, then, and turn for the wiping out of your sins . . . times of revival from before the Lord . . . Jesus, the Messiah appointed beforehand for you, whom heaven must receive until times of establishment of all things which God spake by the mouth of his holy prophets from the beginning of the world.' If RV is correct in its translation of ἀποκαταστάσεως the phrase must mean much the same as παλιγγενεσία in Matt. 19²⁸. If Tr. LC is right in its exegesis of the last clause, ἀποκαταστάσεως governs all that follows it to the end of the verse. The whole clause will then mean: 'until the times when all that God spake by the prophets from the beginning is established or fulfilled through the things prophesied coming to pass.' Such a fulfilment of all prophecy would perhaps cover more than the New World indicated in Isa. 65, 66, etc. But from the point of view of the appeal made in the sermon of Acts 3 the difference can be ignored.

² In Joel 2²⁸ the Hebrew is rendered in RV by 'afterward'. LXX has μετὰ ταῦτα.

outpouring of the Spirit will be accompanied by portents ushering in the Day. The prophecy then passes on to the declaration that 'whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved'. This prophecy, the sermon declares, has been fulfilled, and the Day is therefore at hand. But those who are listening to the sermon are not ready for the Day. The Spirit has now been poured out by the glorified Messiah, whom the hearers of the sermon are accused of having murdered. In so doing, they had opposed themselves at every point to the will and purpose of God (2²²⁻²⁴, 32-36).

This terrible charge struck home; the listeners asked: What shall we do? The answer is based, again, upon Joel. If they are to be saved, this can only be through their calling upon the Lord in repentance for their apostasy.¹ There must be individual² repentance and baptism in the name of Jesus Messiah unto remission of their sins. They will then receive the promised gift of the Holy Spirit (2³⁷⁻³⁹). Thus they may re-enter the true community of the Messiah and be saved in the Day of the Lord. Their salvation will, then, be due to their being identified with the eschatological event instead of being estranged from it. Thus according to the teaching of Acts 2 and 3 the way to salvation is through a repentance and forgiveness which prepare men for the Day of the Lord. This way of salvation is associated on the one hand with baptism and on the other hand with the coming of 'times of revival from before the Lord' and the return of Jesus, the appointed Messiah, in fulfilment of prophecy. Thus the inauguration of the new life is vitally connected with its eschatological goal both by the dispositions required from the side of the neophyte and by the reconciliation with God which that inauguration bestows.

It is possible that Acts 3¹⁹⁻²¹ should be understood as teaching that repentance, turning to God through Christ, and the consequent forgiveness of sins actually hasten the coming of the Son of Man.³ But in any case the argument of these two sermons

¹ LC point out that 'there is probably a play on the words' in this sermon in connexion with the double application of κύριος (1) to Jehovah in Joel 2³² (3⁵ LXX) = Acts 2²¹; (2) to the Messiah in Acts 2³⁴ and to Jesus in 2³⁶. See *Beginnings I*, vol. iv, p. 22.

² ἑκάστος ὑμῶν (v. 38)

³ cp. 2 Pet. 3¹² which may also be understood in this sense

in Acts 2 and 3 further illustrates the connexion of baptism and all for which it stands with the final regeneration, as also the connexion of both with Pentecost. This organic unity of the eschatological event in all its connexions throws light upon the language of the Pauline Epistles concerning the adoption of sons as traced in preceding chapters. The adoption became effectual for each of us in 'the washing of regeneration'. But it will not be complete until we are conformed to the image of God's Son in the final regeneration. In either use of language the end is implicit in the beginning. Our sonship begins in re-birth and renewal of the Holy Spirit. Yet as adopted sons we shall ever be new-born through the ever-renewed gift of the Holy Spirit. The beginning is also carried through to the end. Regeneration characterizes the whole of the New Life.

The re-birth or regeneration, which we have been considering, refers, as we have seen, to the starting-point of the Christian life. This is the primary meaning of the text in Titus, which in turn has obvious affinity with the discourse in John 3. The passage in Titus (3⁴⁻⁷) ascribes the whole of our salvation to God. But God is described as (1) saving us by means of the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost, which in turn (2) 'he poured out upon us . . . through Jesus Christ our Saviour'. Thus regeneration is an act of God through the agency of Jesus Christ and through the instrumentality of baptism. Actually however this is a trinitarian passage. It has close affinities with Acts 2³³ (cp. Luke 24⁴⁹). There the exalted Messiah, having received the promise of the Holy Spirit, poured forth that Spirit upon his disciples. So too here in fact the same theology is present. Salvation is represented as being bestowed in some sense through baptism. But this is so because the re-birth in baptism carries with it a renewing of the Holy Spirit (cp. Acts 2³⁸). The re-birth is associated with both water and the Spirit as in John 3. But also it is traced to an act of God through Christ, just as in Luke and Acts the Spirit is a gift of the Father through the glorified Messiah.

Corresponding to these distinctions there is to be observed in the New Testament a difference of language between passages which refer the new birth to God's action through Christ or through the Word and others which connect regeneration with the Holy Spirit. To the former type belongs the teaching of

1 Peter. In the opening section of the epistle there occurs a prayer of thanksgiving which begins thus:

Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who according to his great mercy begat us again unto a living hope by¹ the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, unto an inheritance incorruptible, and undefiled, and that fadeth not away.

(1 Pet. 1^{3,4})

In this passage St. Paul's two doctrines of the new creation and the adoption of sons are replaced by the single conception of our re-birth to a new life by a divine begetting. For here God does not adopt us to sonship by union with his Son. He begets us as his own children so that we partake, in some sense, of his own life. The new life so generated is unto a living hope, which is more fully explained in the description of the incorruptible inheritance. Perhaps this language implies the thought that the heathen were without God and without hope.² The hopelessness of life without God is again connected with the doctrine, so prominent in St. Paul's teaching, that death follows in the track of sin.³ So too the connexion made in 1 Peter (1^{3,21}) between the resurrection of Christ and the virtue of hope has its parallel in the Pauline teaching that the risen Christ is the second Adam who has conquered sin and death.⁴ But in 1 Peter the connexion of the new creation with our Lord's resurrection has special features of its own.

In the first place, in 1 Peter 1³ the resurrection of our Lord is described as the means through which we were begotten again unto a living hope. In what sense are we to understand that God begat us through the resurrection of Jesus Christ? One thing at least is clear. There is implicit here the characteristically biblical doctrine that God acts through historical events. The New Testament, for example, is pervaded by the idea that the death and resurrection of our Lord constituted a new Exodus out of Egypt. As we have seen, that idea is implied in this epistle in the application to the new Israel of the language used to describe the old Israel after the Exodus.⁵ The resurrection of our Lord was the redemptive act of God whereby he purchased to himself the new Israel. The old Israel, however,

¹ ὁ δὲ

² Eph. 2¹²

³ Rom. 5^{12ff}, 6²¹⁻²³

⁴ 1 Cor. 15, Rom. 5, 6

⁵ 2⁹; cp. Exod. 19^{5,6}, and see p. 169, and n. 3

became God's child through the call of Abraham and the promise to him and to his seed. The redemption from Egypt liberated a people which was already God's son.¹ We must look elsewhere for the explanation; we find it in 1 Peter 3¹⁸⁻²², which is believed to be an early Christian hymn.² The hymn is creed-like in character and connects baptism with the death of Christ, his descent into hell, his resurrection and ascension. It also draws a parallel between the salvation of Noah and his family 'through water' and our salvation in baptism 'through the resurrection of Jesus Christ'. As Noah was saved from death by drowning to a new life after the flood, so does baptism now save us from death through the resurrection of Christ. The former was a type of the latter. Noah was rescued in the ark which floated above the waters. Christ died and descended into hell and then rose again. The neophyte is plunged under the waters and then rises out of the waters and above them, like Christ rising out of the grave. That is the threefold parallel.

Clearly the teachings of Romans 6¹⁻⁴ and 1 Peter 3¹⁸⁻²² belong to a common tradition of apostolic faith and practice. In both there is not only a parallel but a vital connection between baptism and the resurrection of Christ. By an act of creative power God raised Jesus from the dead to a new life. In baptism, according to St. Paul, we were united to Christ's death and resurrection. We were grafted into his dying and rising life and thus became 'a new creature' in him. Thus God made us his sons in the beloved Son. Baptism, according to 1 Peter, saves us 'through the resurrection of Jesus Christ'; for the water of baptism means both death and life, being the antitype in this of Noah's flood.³ Accordingly the earlier text (1 Pet. 1³) must be understood in a similar way. God 'begat us again through the resurrection of Jesus Christ' in baptism. Thus, while Titus 3⁵ connects regeneration with the pentecostal gift of the Spirit, 1 Peter connects re-birth with the messianic events of the gospel story and in particular with our Lord's resurrection. Christ was re-born from the grave; and so are we.

¹ Exod. 4^{22,23}, Hos. 11¹

² J. W. C. Wand (W) *ad loc.*, pp. 99, 100

³ The Flood bore the Ark to safety on Mt. Ararat. So δι' ὕδατος in 3¹⁹ corresponds to δι' ἀναστάσεως in 3²¹ (cp. 1³)

But secondly this re-birth was unto a living hope.¹ The resurrection of Christ is the source of Christian faith and hope (1²¹) both for this life and the next. Accordingly the expression 'begat us again . . . unto a *living* hope' does not permit us to separate the virtue of hope from the new life. The hope is living because it springs up in the new life to which we have been begotten again; and this took place through the resurrection. Our Lord's resurrection is doubtless 'instrumental in our rebirth, because it guarantees both his Messiahship and our immortality'.² But this is not simply a forceful way of saying that 'hope was reborn in us'.³ For the resurrection of Christ was something more than a guarantee of Christian truths. The resurrection was the historical channel through which God acted when he begat us again. This is the explanation of the significant connexion made in 3¹⁸⁻²² between the new birth and the messianic events. The resurrection is not only the ground of our hope. It is the source of the liveliness of that hope; and that because it is the historical ground of the new life in which that living hope blossoms forth.

Accordingly the new life of which God is the begetter is characterized by living hope because it is wholly related to and orientated towards 'an inheritance incorruptible, and undefiled,⁴ and that fadeth not away' to which the risen Lord has opened the way. 'When thou hadst overcome the sharpness of death: thou didst open the kingdom of heaven to all believers.' This inheritance is 'watched over' in heaven for us; and we also are protected for the inheritance by God's power. This security of the inheritance and its immunity from all change and chance rest on God's creative power manifested once for all in the resurrection of Christ.⁵ We also, however, are enlisted to co-operate with the power of God in the garrison duty of a holy war.⁶ 'Through faith', furnished by God's power and grounded

¹ In 1 Pet. 1³ for 'living' (RV) we could, with AV, read 'lively'—a word of more robust associations, as RV itself bears witness in Exod. 1¹⁹

² Wand, *ad loc.*, p. 44, who compares St. Peter's speech in Acts 2 (vv. 31, 32)

³ *ib.*, p. 43

⁴ or perhaps: 'incapable of pollution' (cp. Heb. 7²⁶); on this see Bigg (ICC) *ad loc.*, p. 100

⁵ For this connexion of thought see Eph. 1¹⁸⁻²²

⁶ cp. the eschatological parable in 1 Thess. 5⁴⁻¹⁰

upon the resurrection (v. 5; cp. v. 21), we are safeguarded for the salvation which is 'ready to be revealed in the last time'. Faith, as well as hope, keeps the new-born Christian soldiers alert in eager expectation of the final salvation soon to be unveiled.

The next four verses (6-9) bear a marked similarity to Romans 5²⁻⁹. There is the same note of exultant joy in affliction, through which character is refined. In the present passage faith is refined by trial; in Romans it is hope which is toughened and strengthened. In both passages love is emphasized. There it is the love of God revealed in Christ; here it is our answering love for Christ (v. 8). In 1 Peter, however, there is a sharper emphasis upon suffering and a more passionately eager expectation of the glory to be revealed. The whole passage is deeply apocalyptic in the strict meaning of the word. In Romans hope and joy are connected with our present access into 'this grace in which we have our standing' (5²). But in 1 Peter 1¹³ the expectant Christian soldiers¹ are bidden to keep watch 'and set your hope perfectly on the grace which is being brought² unto you at the revelation of Jesus Christ'. This is the gracious bestowal of glory which will accompany Christ's Second Coming. The new birth intensifies the eagerness of eschatological expectation. It is as though the author were straining his eyes to catch the first glimpse of that last great event. It is as though he were bidding his readers, who never saw the risen Lord and who do not see him now,³ to watch for the rolling up of the veil, so that they may gaze at last upon the radiant form of him 'whom not having seen ye love'.⁴

As in Acts the starting-point of the Christian life is associated with repentance in preparation for the final regeneration, so here it is associated with a call to holiness in view of the imminent Coming of Christ. We invoke as Father the God who is the author of our new life. He says to the new Israel, as to the old: 'Ye shall be holy, for I am holy.' Like them we are sojourners and pilgrims travelling to a promised inheritance

¹ or servants; cp. Luke 12³⁵⁻³⁷

² RV margin

³ οὐκ ἰδόντες . . . μὴ ὁρῶντες (v. 8)

⁴ Note the twice-repeated phrase: ἐν ἀποκαλύψει Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (vv. 7, 13)

(1¹³⁻¹⁷).¹ Like them we look back with gratitude to our redemption with the blood of a lamb. But in our case the ransom paid was the precious² blood of the Messiah himself, the predestined Lamb of God. His sacrifice was foreknown to God 'before the foundation of the world'; but he was manifested as our paschal lamb 'in the last of the times'. All this, the readers are told, was done 'for your sakes'. It is through him that you believe in the God who raised him. If our re-birth came through the resurrection, the faith which corresponds to the re-birth is grounded upon the revelation given in the resurrection (1¹⁸⁻²¹).

So the summons of the new-born Christians to holiness³ invites them to be 'children of obedience'.⁴ They are to obey the holy Father who begat them, in accordance with the pattern of obedience revealed in him with whose paschal blood they were sprinkled (vv. 2, 14). Their holiness is to take the form of obedience to the truth and love of the brethren (1²²). The whole of this first chapter, when compared with other great passages in the epistle,⁵ helps us to understand the meaning given to the Word of God in the closing verses (1²³⁻²⁵). If faith and hope are generated in us by the resurrection, that is partly because the resurrection throws a flood of light upon the sufferings of the Messiah in which we are called to share. The truth which we are summoned to obey is set forth in the pattern of suffering and glory in the Messiah. This is the whole meaning of God's word in Scripture (1¹⁰⁻¹²). Above all we have confidence in God our Father, because of the glory of the resurrection which followed the predestined sufferings (1^{11, 21}). For this reason the resurrection is singled out (1³) from the chain of messianic events (1¹⁹⁻²¹, 3¹⁸⁻²²) through which we were begotten again. For we were

begotten again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, through the word⁶ of God, which liveth and abideth. For,

All flesh is as grass,
And all the glory thereof as the flower of grass.

¹ With τῆς παροικίας (v. 17) cp. 1¹ and 2¹¹. Compare also the parallel with Israel in the wilderness in the quotation from Leviticus (v. 16); ch. 2⁹⁻¹¹ combines similar ideas.

² cp. 2^{6, 7}

³ cp. 2^{1ff}

⁴ The word ὑπακοή is repeated three times (1^{2, 14, 22})

⁵ especially 2¹⁹⁻²⁵, 3¹⁸⁻²², 4¹²⁻¹⁶

⁶ λόγος

The grass withereth, and the flower falleth:
But the word¹ of the Lord abideth for ever.²

And this is the word¹ of good tidings which was preached unto you. (1 Pet. 1²³⁻²⁵)

This passage should be compared with the following: John 1^{12,13}, James 1^{18,21} and 1 John 3⁹, 5^{1,18}. All of these, like 1 Peter 1³, speak of Christian regeneration in terms of a divine begetting; and all of them more or less explicitly refer this divine begetting to the instrumentality of the divine Word. But with that measure of agreement the passages in question vary greatly in their treatment of the theme. In 1 Peter 1³, as we have seen, the reference to the Word of God is implicit in the reference to the resurrection of Christ through which God's character was revealed. The references to the Word in the passage just quoted must be interpreted by the concluding phrase (v. 25). The Word here is the gospel as preached to the heathen in the first Christian age. It may be assumed to include all that 1 Peter includes in its teaching about Jesus Christ and his salvation.³ Another question which may be asked has reference to the metaphor employed. Is the seed mentioned vegetable or human? In James 1²¹ the metaphor is certainly botanical. Elsewhere, however, (in the Johannine passages) the reference is clearly to human seed. This also best fits our present text (1 Pet. 1²³).

In the passage before us the quotation from Isaiah, reinforcing the contrast between corruptible and incorruptible seed, emphasizes the frailty and weakness of mortal man. Man is like grass in his transience. The Word of God, however, is not mortal but living, not transient but abiding. There is therefore a double contrast, (*a*) between man and the Word, (*b*) between two kinds of seed, corruptible and incorruptible. But the Word is not identified with the incorruptible seed. They are expressly distinguished.⁴ There is in fact here a close parallel with John 1^{12,13}. There the divine begetting of Christians is contrasted with the natural begetting which issues in natural human birth. So here; man is transient and mortal, because he is begotten of corruptible human seed. Christians, however, have

¹ *λόγος*

² cited from Isa. 40⁸⁻⁹; cp. Jas. 1^{10,11}

³ on which see the preceding pages

⁴ by different prepositions (*ἐκ* and *διὰ*)

been begotten of an incorruptible seed which is divine, not human. The explanation given is that we have been begotten through the living and abiding Word of God. The preposition 'through' is the same as in 1³, where we are begotten again 'through the resurrection of Jesus Christ'. Now in the Old Testament the Word of God is creative as well as living.¹ Verse 23 therefore develops the thought of verse 3. The resurrection of our Lord was a creative act of God inaugurating the new life. This epistle comes very near to saying that the risen Christ is the Word of God, as St. Paul had said that he is 'life-giving spirit'.² In Colossians 1¹⁵⁻¹⁸ he is also declared to be 'the firstborn of all creation' and 'the firstborn from the dead'.³ These prerogatives were manifested through his resurrection. But by that fact also he actually became 'the beginning' or source of the new creation.

We cannot tell whether 1 Peter owes anything to this particular Pauline passage. But clearly the author is moving in the direction of the full Johannine doctrine of the Word incarnate. His position is an intermediate one. He uses *logos* in contrast to the less comprehensive expression in the quotation from Isaiah. On the other hand he applies the quotation to his readers by saying that this 'word of the Lord' which 'abideth for ever' is the word of good tidings which was preached to you. They were begotten again through hearing the preaching of the Gospel. That was the first step to their initiation. Now the apostolic proclamation was largely concerned with our Lord's resurrection, and would have had no existence apart from it. The risen Lord was the content of the gospel preached.

In the first Christian age conversion and regeneration were the two sides of the one shield of Christian initiation. The Gospel changed men's 'hearts' and led them to the baptismal waters. Henceforth as 'new-born babes' they were to put off the old life continuously, and to put on the new.⁴ This is the practical conclusion from the fact of re-birth which is now inculcated in the readers of 1 Peter (2¹⁻³). Moreover, if they are to realize all that their new birth implies, they should long for

¹ cp. Gen. 1, Ps. 33⁶, Isa. 55¹¹

² 1 Cor. 15⁴⁵

³ The Head of both creations, who placed himself within them both, although Creator of both. See further, p. 404 below.

⁴ Eph. 4²²⁻²⁴

the 'pure milk' which is the proper nourishment of their new life. They have already tasted the Lord and found him good. Let them continue on the same diet, that they may grow up to the maturity which belongs to the Coming Salvation of the Last Time. If this passage was addressed, as has been supposed, to newly-baptized Christians, it would strike home with peculiar force. But the author would certainly not have thought his exhortation inappropriate to more mature Christians. In chapter 1 he inculcates holy fear and obedience in a way which suggests that the graces of the childlike are permanent qualities of the Christian life. His 'new-born babes' are, with a sudden change of metaphor, told that the Lord who is their 'pure milk' is also a 'living stone', the foundation-stone of the new temple. They are being built up, through coming to him, into a 'spiritual house, a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God through Jesus Christ' (2⁴, 5).

There is no hint here of immaturity, or of a gap to be bridged between their new-born state and their privilege of offering acceptable sacrifices. The 'new-born babes' of 1 Peter are not the spiritually immature 'backward children' whom we come across in Hebrews 5¹¹–6³. In fact Hebrews 5¹³ is verbally in contradiction to 1 Peter 2^{2,3}. There we learn that 'everyone that partaketh of milk is without experience of the word of righteousness; for he is a babe'. Here, however, we are told that 'the new-born babes' had already tasted that the Lord is good.¹ In 1 Peter, moreover, there is no trace of the distinction made by Hebrews between the immature who drink milk and the mature who eat solid food. Still further removed is the passage we are considering from the thought of St. Paul about the Corinthian Christians whom he felt obliged to rebuke (1 Cor. 3^{1ff}).² They also are contrasted with the mature. But their case is more serious than that contemplated in Hebrews. They are not simply slow-witted or 'dull of hearing' (Heb. 5¹¹). They are spiritually childish. They are quarrelsome and egotistical; not simply children, but spoilt children, whose world revolves round themselves.

¹ 'If' here 'does not express a doubt, but marks a condition that has been fulfilled' (Wand, *ad loc.*, p. 65); cp. M: 'you have had a taste'

² see pp. 112, 113 above

The babes of 1 Peter are not immature but innocent, not childish but childlike. They illustrate the truth that the new birth is no mere starting-point, but rather a great many-arched bridge, which spans all the barren wastes of our journey as 'sojourners of the dispersion' (1¹). If we keep the childlike character with which we first accepted the Gospel and submitted to God's rule¹ as 'children of obedience', we shall find this bridge firm under our feet until we reach the incorruptible inheritance which is situated at the end of our pilgrim-way. So too the milk with which the new-born babes are nourished is not the catechism-teaching of Hebrews 6^{1,2}. Whatever meaning we give to the word rendered 'spiritual' in this passage,² the milk itself is nothing less than the Lord Christ himself. He is the milk of the word offered freely to those who thirst.³ He is the righteousness, for which whoso thirsts is accounted to be blessed by the Lord himself.⁴ This is the appropriate food of new-born Christians. It will never cease to be our proper food, however mature we may become. In fact the more matured the Christian life becomes, the more truly it partakes of the regenerate character. The development of Christian holiness is an advance towards the simplicity of the Gospel, towards the single eye of which our Lord spoke, and the single-hearted devotion to the Lord of which his apostle wrote.⁵ This childlike simplicity which belongs to the greater ones in the kingdom of heaven⁶ is a partaking of the heavenly wisdom. For that wisdom is unwavering in its directness and whole-hearted in its sincerity.⁷ These qualities were manifested by our Lord himself, 'whom God has made our Wisdom,'⁸ and whose meat was to do the will of him that sent him.⁹

These marks of the regenerate life designate it as coming from him who begat us again through his word. Upon this subject further light is thrown by the Epistle of St. James to which we must now turn. The passage to be considered follows upon the treatment of trial and temptation with which the epistle opens. In 1¹³ an objection is put into the mouth of the

¹ Matt. 18¹⁻⁴; cp. Mark 10¹³⁻¹⁶, Luke 18¹⁵⁻¹⁷

² 1 Pet. 2² (RV and M)

³ Isa. 55¹

⁴ Matt. 5⁸

⁵ Matt. 6²², 2 Cor. 11³; cp. 1 Cor. 14²⁰: 'in malice be ye babes'

⁶ Matt. 18⁴

⁷ Jas. 3¹⁷: ἀδιδίκριτος, ἀνυπόκριτος

⁸ 1 Cor. 1³⁰ (M)

⁹ John 4³⁴

tempted man. He is represented as saying: 'My temptation comes from God' (M). To this the author replies that temptation comes, not from God, but from within the man himself. Each one is lured and enticed by his own desire. As a result of this liaison Desire conceives and bears Sin. Sin, in turn, when it has come to maturity gives birth¹ to Death. Such is the genealogy of sin; we deceive ourselves if we lay the blame upon God (vv. 13-16). For he is the author of good; and all his gifts to us are good, coming down from 'the Father of the heavenly lights' (v. 17 M). He is the Sun of righteousness, and it is his nature to send good gifts because his nature is unvarying. In this he is unlike the heavenly bodies which he created. Their light alternates with darkness; but his light ever shines: 'from him proceeds no turning shadow'.² The next verse runs as follows:

Of his own will he brought us forth³ by the word of truth, that we should be a kind of firstfruits of his creatures. (Jas. 1¹⁸)

The tempted man's will is led captive by Desire. His sin is the result of seduction. God on the other hand 'brought us forth' willingly and of deliberate purpose. He is not only our benefactor (v. 17) but our Father. As Christians we owe our re-birth to him through the word of truth, that is, the Gospel.⁴ He singled us Christians out from all his creation to be a kind of firstfruits to be offered to himself.⁵ In the Old Testament the firstfruits, including firstborn of man and beast, were sacred and often offered to God. So Jeremiah (2⁸) speaks of Israel as 'holiness unto the Lord, the firstfruits of his increase'. In contrast to other nations Israel was God's firstborn.⁶ So elsewhere in the New Testament Christians are called firstfruits, as the new Israel.⁷ By our regeneration we occupy the privileged position which once belonged to the old Israel. We must not, therefore, give way to sin. Sins of speech especially are to be

¹ ἀποκνέϊ

² J. H. Ropes (ICC) *ad loc.*, p. 161

³ ἀπεκύησεν

⁴ In Eph. 1¹³ Gentile Christians are reminded that they had once 'heard the word of the truth, the gospel of your salvation'; that they had believed, and consequently been initiated; for which see above, p. 185

⁵ The arguments for referring the whole verse to the new creation in Christ are convincing.

⁶ Exod. 4²², Jer. 31⁹

⁷ Rev. 14⁴ and perhaps 2 Thess. 2¹³ (RV margin)

avoided, for 'the wrath of man worketh not the righteousness of God' (vv. 18-20).

In this passage a strong contrast is made between the generation of sin from desire and the regeneration of Christians by God's will. We may compare the contrast in 1 Peter between the corruptible seed of man and the incorruptible seed of God, and again the contrast in John 1¹³ between the divine begetting and natural human begetting. This contrast is accentuated by the use of the same word in verse 15 for sin's 'bringing forth' of death and in verse 18 for God's act in 'bringing forth' us to new life. In order to produce this effect the author is obliged to use a word for God's act which strictly refers to the maternal function of giving birth. This paradoxical use has, however, precedents in the Old Testament, where ungodly men are spoken of as conceiving mischief, travailing with iniquity, and bringing forth iniquity or falsehood.¹ In all these examples the maternal metaphors are referred to the human mind and the acts which proceed from thoughts. In English we use such words as 'conceive' and 'conception' in a similar fashion. In the present passage there is a contrast between 'conception' by human desire and 'conception' by the divine will.² Now the thoughts which we conceive are expressed by means of words. So here the divine will brings us forth by 'the word of truth'. The divine purpose to bestow new life upon us was effected by way of revelation.

God's will and nature were expressed or revealed in the Gospel. By the Gospel he made his appeal to us. Now the Gospel was good news about God embodied in his historical acts. By these, especially through the crucifixion as seen in the light of the resurrection, he proved his love for us. The love revealed upon the Cross moves men to a response of love, which is the first step to the new life.³ So it was in the Old Testament story. The promises to Abraham were words, which became embodied in the acts of power whereby God made Israel his firstborn and brought him to the promised inheritance. But these embodied words claimed and implied a response from

¹ Job 15³⁵, Ps. 7¹⁴, Isa. 59⁴

² *συλλαβοῦσα* and *βουληθεῖς*. It is a contrast of passion with deliberate purpose.

³ see above, p. 201 and pp. 96-106

the firstborn, dedicated to be a 'kind of firstfruits of his creatures'. In Christ, however, the Promise was wholly embodied. This thought does not appear in St. James as it does in St. Paul and in 1 Peter. None the less the present passage represents a stage on the road to the doctrine of the Word incarnate.

The picture of the firstfruits and perhaps also the description of the Father of lights suggest to the author a further development of his thoughts about the new birth. Wicked men conceive wicked thoughts¹ which are expressed in wicked words (v. 19). God however conceives good thoughts which issue in good words. Now since all his giving is good and everything which he bestows is perfect (v. 17), he sends his good words into our hearts. For 'the seed is the word of God'² and men's hearts are the soil into which it falls. The seed may be choked by weeds;³ for the soil which brings forth weeds cannot find room for the good seed. So we are to be swift to hear the good words of God and slow to say anything which may hinder their growth (vv. 19, 20). But more than that is needed. The ground must be cleared of all encumbrances that the good seed may have a chance.

So clear away all the foul rank growth of malice, and make a soil of humble modesty for the Word which roots itself inwardly⁴ with power to save your souls. (Jas. 1²¹ M)

Dr. Moffatt's admirable translation of this familiar verse makes its meaning stand out clearly. The weeds of sin are filthy and superfluous, as the old translation suggested. Repentance clears away the obstacles which hinder God's grace from acting. Faith can open the soil up and make it receptive. All this may result from hearing the Word; but God alone can bestow the Word. By repentance and faith we may 'make a soil of humble modesty' and so 'receive with meekness' what God has to bestow.⁵

So the seed of the Word enters good soil and strikes root inwardly and deeply until it 'has entered into union with the nature and heart of man'.⁶ It is able to take the soil of our hearts

¹ see above, p. 205

² Mark 4^{18, 19}, Luke 8^{7, 14}

³ Repentance and faith are, of course, themselves effects of grace in us; see pp. 119, 120 above

⁴ Ropes, *ad loc.*, p. 172

⁵ Luke 8¹¹

⁶ τὸν ἐμφυτον λόγον

to itself and make it fruitful. It has the power to save our souls by making them bring forth fruits of character well-pleasing to God. For this soil is dedicated land. It belongs to God; and he expects from it the offering of firstfruits. The Word also is a perfect gift from the Father of lights. Possibly the author was reflecting that seed embodies the energy of light which comes from the sun. So the seed of the Word embodies the warm light and life which come down from the Father of lights. For God is the Sun of righteousness, the uncreated light, whose splendour is never dimmed. The Word of the Gospel comes from him bringing life into our souls. For it is the word of truth, for lack of which our souls were starved and barren.

Thus the Word becomes part of our nature.¹ The land bearing a rich harvest of corn is something other than it was before the seed was sown. So Christ the Word takes human nature to himself and by that very fact makes it something new. The natural is transformed when it partakes of the supernatural. Just in so far as the Word, as the seed, is identified with Christ, the teaching of St. James passes over into a form approximating to St. Paul's doctrine of 'Christ in you the hope of glory'.² But this identification is not suggested in the passage which we have been considering. The author occupies a mediating position which is neither Pauline nor Johannine. For him the word of truth which strikes deep root into the heart of the attentive listener is also the supreme Law, in obedience to which a man finds freedom (1²⁵, 2⁸; cp. 4¹¹). The man who hears or reads it, however, must not forget what he has heard or read. Something more is needed than a careless glance which does not sink beyond the surface of the mind.³ The Word must fructify in deeds, not simply acts of formal piety but acts of love to the brethren (1²²⁻²⁷).⁴

The word of truth is the Christian law to which we must conform our lives. This law is like a mirror. Gazing into it and contemplating the image of truth which it reflects, we shall retain that image in our minds. It will, so to say, become immanent in the heart and like the good seed will fructify in good works (vv. 23-25). So our conduct towards the brethren will accord with our faith in the Lord Jesus Messiah. For he

¹ This is at least one aspect of ἐμφύτον

² Col. 1²⁷

³ cp. Mark 4^{4, 15}, Luke 8^{6, 12}

⁴ cp. also the whole of ch. 2

reflects the divine glory of the Father of lights.¹ All true Christians will hereafter be partakers of that glory. Their earthly status counts for nothing in God's eyes. For he chose 'the poor by the standard of the world'² to be rich in the sphere of faith 'and inheritors of the kingdom which he promised to those that love him' (2¹⁻⁵). We see here how near St. James comes to identifying the word of truth with 'the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ'.³ The image of truth in the mirror is the revelation of God's Law in Holy Scripture as understood by Christians. But the clue to what they see in the mirror is in fact the glory of Jesus Christ.⁴ St. James here touches the high road of Christology which leads from St. Paul through Hebrews 1¹⁻⁴ to John 1¹⁻¹⁸.

The connexion which has been traced between the new birth and the glory of Christ in St. James is made explicit in the prologue of St. John's Gospel. A connecting link is to be found also in St. Paul's statement that

We all, with unveiled face reflecting as a mirror⁵ the glory of the Lord, are transformed into the same image from glory to glory. (2 Cor. 3¹⁸)

If the Christian is like a mirror reflecting a glory which does not fade, our transformation into the same image by stages, 'passing from one glory to another' (M), is effected through continuous contemplation of the image, that is, the likeness of the Lord set before us in the Gospel. So the marginal rendering of the Revised Version helps us to understand the implications of the rendering in the text. However, the picture of the Christian as himself a mirror reflecting the divine glory is not in St. James.⁶ We find the new birth and the glory together in the closest connexion in the following:

As many as received him, to them gave he the right to become children of God, even to them that believe on his name: which

¹ or possibly: 'is the divine glory,' etc. On τῆς δόξης in 2¹ see above, p. 38, note 1.

² Ropes, *ad loc.* (2⁵), p. 193

³ 2 Cor. 4⁶

⁴ Those who believe in that glory should know how to put the Law into practice (2¹)

⁵ 'beholding as in a mirror' (RV margin)

⁶ Similar images are to be found in Matt. 5¹⁴⁻¹⁶, Phil. 2¹⁵ and 1 Pet. 2⁹

were begotten,¹ not of bloods,¹ nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God. And the Word became flesh, and dwelt among us (and we beheld his glory, glory as of the only-begotten from the Father), full of grace and truth.

(John 1¹²⁻¹⁴)

This statement is completed in the conclusion of the prologue (vv. 16-18). It must also be compared with the passages in this gospel which speak of 'believing', of Christ's 'word' and of his 'glory'. Moreover, closely connected with such passages in the gospel are those in the First Epistle of St. John which show a similar connexion of thought and language (2²⁹-3³, 3^{9,10}, 4^{7,8}, 5^{1,4,18}). The passage which we are now considering forms the central part of a hymn to the Word. The Word is described in personal language as pre-existing in the beginning with God, as himself God, and as the agent of God in creation. His personal activity in history is next referred to (with a note on his relation to the Baptist). In verse 11 we are told of his advent to his own home (the Holy Land) and of his rejection by his own people, Israel. But the rejection was not complete. Some of his own did receive him, and to them he gave the right to become God's children. This language is important. It is the Johannine parallel to St. Paul's teaching about adoption. Men are not God's children by creation, in St. John's view, but by a community of nature which is conferred by God upon those who receive the Word.² Israel as a whole forfeited its right to this privilege by its rejection of the Word. The expression: 'as many as received him' suggests the original company of his disciples who formed the new family of God's children in contrast to rejected Israel. Historically 'as many as received him' succeeded to the right and title of God's children. But the explanatory clause which follows shows that there is no idea of limiting God's new family to the original body of disciples. The phrase: 'all who received him' in itself suggests a condition which can be fulfilled in every successive age of the new creation. It is now explained as including all those who 'believe on his name'. If the new family took the place of the old at a definite period of history, it is not limited to that period. It includes all who believe in the Word incarnate.

There is, however, a further distinction marked in the

¹ RV margin

² but see below, p. 403

change of tense from 'received' to 'believe'.¹ The new birth is here regarded as both past and present. Those who 'received him' 'were begotten of God'.² The divine act of begetting presupposed a human response to the coming of the Word; for God does not treat men as puppets. The new birth was granted to rational beings. All this refers to a definite historical occasion. The original response of the disciples to the coming of the Word made possible God's act by which they became his children. That original response, however, was no mere past event which is over and done with. It gave them the right and privilege of becoming God's children. But it also implied and involved a continuous attitude of faith in the name of the Word. The next verse but one makes it clear that this last phrase ('believe on his name') refers to the Word incarnate who, again, in verse 17, is identified with Jesus Christ. This continuous attitude of faith was directed towards the Word incarnate in his manifested character as he revealed himself to his believing disciples. What is here stated to have been true of the original disciples expresses a permanent truth about the new birth. The conditions under which Christian neophytes 'received him' have varied from age to age. But, under whatever conditions, that event was pre-supposed in our initiation. When we 'received him', God received us as his children. That twofold event lies in the past. It has been followed by the continuous exercise of faith in the Word incarnate, which is, on our side, the human foundation of the Christian life. The new birth introduced us into the fellowship of those 'who believe on his name'. That is the abiding correlative of the privilege, granted to us, of becoming God's children.

There is one further point to be noticed in verse 12. The privilege of becoming God's children was given by the Word to those who received him. They had in themselves no title to this privilege, no right to claim it. 'His own people received him not' very largely because they had come to regard themselves as God's children by right of descent from Abraham. But 'God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham'.³ The right to become God's children in the new creation is a right wholly at the disposal of the Word incarnate. Thus at every

¹ from the aorist (ἐλάβον) to the present participle (τοῖς πιστεύουσιν)

² ἐγεννήθησαν

³ Matt. 3⁹; cp. John 8^{38ff}

point the new birth depends upon the Word. There would have been no re-birth unless he had become incarnate. The re-birth is a privilege granted by him as a result of his Incarnation. At each occasion of new birth he gave this privilege to those who received him. Finally when the re-birth has taken place, its privileges continue to imply a state of dependence upon the Word incarnate. The children of God are those who are pledged to a life of faith directed towards Jesus Christ. But 'the Word was God' (v. 1) and all his acts are acts of God. So the dependence of the new birth upon the Word can also be stated in another way. Those to whom the Word gave the right to become children of God 'were begotten', not under the physical conditions of human generation, not under the impulse of sexual appetite, nor lastly on the initiative of a human father. None of these human conditions were present. They were 'begotten of God' (v. 13).

Once again the divine source of the new birth and its divine character are contrasted with the limitations of our human nature. The new birth is wholly spiritual in its origin and in its characteristics. It does not depend in any way upon our frail human organisms, upon our vacillating impulses or upon our wayward desires.¹ It comes from God, originating in his purpose and brought to actual fulfilment through the agency of his Word. The whole of these facts about the new birth are aptly summarized by the First Epistle of St. John in these words: 'Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is begotten of God' (5¹). There is a contrast here between the tenses of the two verbs.² He who believes has been begotten.³ The tenses 'make it clear that the Divine Begetting is the antecedent, not the consequence of the believing'.⁴ The full life of faith in Jesus as the Messiah is a characteristic of the new-born. It is a product of the divine begetting in which the new birth originates. The source of Christian faith is not human, but divine.

Moreover in this present faith of one who has been reborn there is a definite content. It is not only directed towards Jesus

¹ But for another possibility see below, p. 436, n. 1

² πιστεύων . . . γεγέννηται

³ and so 'is born of God' (M)

⁴ A. E. Brooke (ICC) *ad loc.*, p. 128, quoting from R. Law, *The Tests of Life*. See the whole note.

Christ, as John 1¹² makes clear. It also involves a conviction about his person and status. This is also implied in the phrase 'on' or 'in his name' in John 1¹². The full implications of 'his name' for the author of this gospel are unfolded by him in the remainder of his prologue (1¹⁴⁻¹⁸) and more widely in the book as a whole.¹ Thus the Epistle and the Gospel state complementary truths. Our faith in Jesus as the Christ is a consequence of the new birth.² For 'Christian belief . . . is a function of the Divine life as imparted to men'.³ But also the new birth itself was a consequence of the fact that Jesus is the Christ. Apart from Jesus Christ the new birth could not have taken place; for it implies that faith in him has real significance. Re-birth and faith therefore go together by a conjunction of inseparable facts such as we found⁴ in Romans 5^{5, 6}. This truth that the new birth and faith in Christ are inseparable is fundamental to the Johannine doctrine of the divine begetting (1¹³). For the new birth is wholly dependent upon the Incarnation as described in 1¹⁴⁻¹⁸.

The statements in verse 14 may be understood to mean: (i) that by becoming incarnate the Word pitched his tent (and so dwelt) among us, that is, among the original witnesses of his earthly life and ministry; and (ii) that we, the same witnesses, beheld with our bodily eyes his glory, 'the glory such as the only Son receives from his Father'.⁵ The verse concludes with a third statement (iii) that the Word (incarnate) was full of grace and truth.⁶ There is an alternative rendering of the phrase for which the Revised Version has: 'dwelt among us'; this would not confine the 'us' here to the original witnesses.⁷ But in any case we are told in verse 16 that 'of his fulness we all received'. There is therefore a contrast between the limited number of eye-witnesses and the Christian community as a whole ('we all'). Every Christian, as such, partakes of the fulness of grace and

¹ with a concluding statement in 20³¹; cp. 20²⁸

² i.e. *our* faith as Christians. There is a more rudimentary faith which may be antecedent to the new birth.

³ R. Law, quoted by Brooke, *loc. cit.*

⁴ see above, pp. 96ff

⁵ J. H. Bernard (ICC), p. 23

⁶ On the connexion of *πλήρης* with *λόγος* see Bernard, pp. 24, 25

⁷ For this see Bernard (pp. 20, 21) *ὅν ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν*. See also below, pp. 315ff

truth which are in Jesus. We are all begotten again through the Word of God;¹ and the renewed life which follows the new birth is a partaking of his fulness. Moreover the fulness of grace and truth is closely connected with the glory of the only-begotten. Though not eye-witnesses of that glory we have access to it. For the faith of the newly-begotten Christian finds its proper object in the glory of the only-begotten Son, just as our regeneration is grounded upon his eternal generation. It is, indeed, by contemplating his glory that we become partakers of the fulness of grace and truth that are in him.

The prologue concludes with the statement that, although God is wholly invisible, yet his only-begotten Son, who is God,² and 'who lies upon the Father's breast' (M) is he who interpreted him (1¹⁸). This statement had profound implications for the author³ which must be passed over here. More generally, however, the last sentence of the prologue defines the theme of the book as a whole. It is the 'exhibition⁴ to the world of God in Christ'.⁵ Now we have seen that, according to the prologue, the divine begetting of Christians is wholly dependent upon the Incarnation. In its final sentence (1¹⁸) the author lets us see one of the implications of this fact. God was revealed by his only Son. The new birth, therefore, depends upon that revelation. This theme is developed in the gospel as a whole. Jesus himself teaches the secret of new birth to Nicodemus (3^{1a}). There is an intimate connexion between 'life' and 'light' in this gospel from its opening words onwards (1³⁻¹⁰);⁶ so it was fitting that the Light of the world (8¹²), who is God's Word, should teach the secret of entry into new Life.

The conversation begins with a confession of Nicodemus that he and others recognize the claims of Jesus as a teacher sent by God. The ground of this conviction is stated to be 'the signs which thou doest'. 'We know' because of what we can see (cp. 2²³). To this Jesus replies:

Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born from above,⁷ he cannot see the kingdom of God. (John 3³)

¹ cp. 1 Pet. 1²³

² RV margin

³ cp. John 13²³

⁴ ἐξήγησις

⁵ Bernard, p. 33

⁶ cp. also 'glory' and 'fulness', 'grace' and 'truth' in 1¹⁴⁻¹⁵

⁷ RV margin and M

If we follow important authorities in adopting the rendering 'from above' for the Greek word so rendered elsewhere,¹ this will not exclude the truth stated in the text of the Revised Version. The greater includes the less. The birth 'from above' is obviously new. It is a second birth, a 'regeneration', which presupposes our natural birth. On the other hand the whole character and significance of this second birth is due to the fact of its heavenly origin. It comes from God; for he is its author. By contrast with the mysteries of the Godhead it belongs to 'the earthly things' (v. 12). For it takes place in human beings here on earth. Yet, just because it comes from God, its full significance runs up into a higher order, 'the heavenly things' of which only the Son of man can speak, because he came down from heaven (v. 13; cp. vv. 31, 32).

For this very reason 'except a man be born from above he cannot see the kingdom of God'. The Jews were familiar with the notion of God's kingdom as a certainty to come. But they expected visible signs to accompany it (cp. 2²³, 6¹⁴). Our Lord, however, taught that it 'cometh not with observation'.² When challenged about his own kingdom he said that it was 'not of this world', and then, more positively, that his mission was to bear witness to the truth. 'Every one that is of the truth heareth my voice.'³ He is the master of a kingdom of truth. The King of truth speaks, and his voice is heard by his subjects. So here the kingdom of God surpasses that new world for which the Jews looked, the conditions of whose coming they supposed that they understood. It can be 'seen' only by those who are new-born from above.⁴ The negative in John 3³ corresponds to that in Mark 10¹⁵: 'Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall in no wise enter therein.'⁵

The condition: 'as a little child' is here interpreted as involving a birth 'from above'. So also the synoptic teaching about entry into the kingdom re-appears in a new setting in John 3⁵. The whole of verse 3, however, is a rebuke to Nicodemus. If he

¹ e.g. 3³¹, 19¹¹; see further, Bernard's note, p. 102

² Luke 17²⁰

³ John 18³⁶, 37

⁴ cp. the God whom 'no man hath ever seen' (1¹⁸), and the emphasis of 1 Peter upon faith in the invisible Jesus of the coming apocalypse; see above, p. 198

⁵ see above, pp. 201-203

was acquainted with the idea that a convert to Judaism is 'a child newly born', he would certainly not appreciate the doctrine that *none* can see the kingdom without re-birth from above. The following verse (4) may be interpreted in two ways, a lower or a higher. Do the questions about being born 'a second time' represent a stupid or wilful misunderstanding? Or is the teacher of Israel (v. 10) saying that this heavenly re-birth is a 'hard saying' (6⁶⁰), a difficult miracle, which contradicts all natural analogies? In view of his later record of discipleship in this gospel (7⁵⁰⁻⁵², 19³⁸⁻⁴²) the latter seems the more probable conclusion. But his difficulty is due to his putting the emphasis in the wrong place. The new birth will always seem improbable to those whose attention is fixed upon the new start rather than upon the heavenly resources which make it possible. Contemporary Judaism at its best was bound to be baffled by the radical transformation which the Gospel of Jesus required. The reply of Jesus to the questions reaffirms the law of the new birth in more explicit terms:

Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit. Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be born from above.¹ The wind bloweth² where it listeth, and thou hearest the voice thereof, but knowest not whence it cometh, and whither it goeth: so is everyone that is born of the Spirit.
(John 3⁵⁻⁸)

It is probable that from verse 3 onwards we should read 'begotten' for 'born' in this passage. In 1¹³ the same word certainly means 'begotten' and this is the prevailing Johannine use. The emphasis therefore is upon God's fatherhood.³ In the prologue God begets us through the incarnate Word. In the present passage he begets us 'of water and the Spirit'. Now the fourth gospel is from its opening phrase onwards essentially a gospel of the new creation. In these early chapters, in particular, it is modelled on the book of Genesis, and has in view the details of the first creation. In the Psalter we read: 'By the word of the Lord were the heavens made; and all the host of them by the

¹ RV margin

² RV margin: 'the Spirit breatheth'

³ cp. 1 John 3⁹, where the metaphor becomes fully explicit

breath of his mouth' (Ps. 33⁶). God creates by his word and breath; moreover the Greek and Hebrew words for 'spirit' can also mean 'wind' or 'breath'. So again we read: 'He sendeth out his word and melteth them: he causeth his wind to blow and the waters flow' (Ps. 147¹⁸). The imagery is suggested by familiar facts. When we speak we breathe; so word and breath go forth together. At the beginning of the creation-poem in Genesis 1 there is darkness; the earth is waste and void. But the spirit (breath) of God was moving upon the face of the waters. The word for 'spirit' is feminine, and there is a suggestion that God's breath is in the form of a bird, hovering or brooding over the primeval deep with generative power. Then God spoke, and his word brought light and life.

So in the new creation God begat us again from heaven through his Word and from his Spirit. In the development of this analogy in John 3⁵⁻⁸ we can distinguish three stages: they refer respectively to (i) water and spirit, (ii) flesh and spirit, (iii) wind and spirit.

(i) In verse 5 we learn that there can be no entry into the kingdom of God except through a begetting which is from, or of, 'water and the Spirit'. The transformation of the synoptic saying is here carried a step further. The condition of receiving the kingdom 'as a little child' involves re-birth or begetting from above. That begetting is now further defined in terms of 'water and the Spirit'. As 'in the beginning' so also in the new beginning,¹ God breathes upon the waters to bring forth life. Creation is by the breath of his mouth. When his wind blows, the waters of the new life flow. The two basic forms of Scriptural imagery about the Spirit are here found together. The waters over which the Spirit of God first hovered belonged to an empty formless void. But the waters of Christian baptism are waters of regeneration flowing down from a celestial fount.²

What is the explanation of this difference between the first creation and the second? The clue lies in the relation of the divine begetting to the kingdom of God. In the prologue it is made clear that we are newly-begotten children through the

¹ Gen. 1¹, John 1¹

² cp. *ἀνωθεν* in verses 3 and 7 with what was said in Chapter III about celestial waters (pp. 82-95)

Incarnation of the only-begotten Son. The source of this language is to be found in a messianic psalm:

I have set my king
Upon my holy hill of Zion.
I will tell of the decree:
The Lord hath said unto me, Thou art my Son;
This day have I begotten thee. (Ps. 2^{6,7})

The only-begotten Son is the messianic king. Those who are begotten of God through his Word are made partakers in the sonship of the Messiah. For them the gates of God's kingdom are open; for they belong to the family of God, which is also the community of the messianic king.

Now between the prologue (John 1¹⁻¹⁸) and the conversation with Nicodemus (3¹⁻¹⁵) there is set the witness of John Baptist concerning the baptism of Jesus (1²⁹⁻³⁶). In this passage the whole Christology of the fourth gospel is implicit. The incarnate Word¹ who is also the Lamb of God² enters the water and receives baptism from John. Up to this point the Baptist knew him not (1³¹). But now he saw a dove descending from heaven upon the head of Jesus; this he accepted as a sign. Jesus is the messianic king and therefore the Son of God (Ps. 2). For in him there is fulfilled the prophecy of Isaiah 11¹⁻⁵ and also that of Isaiah 61. All lines of prophecy meet in him upon whom the Spirit descends (1³²⁻³⁴).³ Once more the Spirit hovers over the waters like a bird.⁴ But now the waters no longer belong to a formless world of darkness. In them stands the form of the Messiah who is the Word of God and the Light of the world (1⁴⁻⁹; cp. 8¹²). He is the fountain-source of the new creation. He is anointed with the descending Spirit, that we may be baptized with the Spirit by him. Through him we are begotten

¹ 1³⁰ asserts the pre-existence of Jesus in language which is repeated from 1¹⁵

² In 1²⁹, 36 Jesus is identified with the Servant of Isa. 53 who is 'led as a lamb to the slaughter' and whose soul is made an offering for sin (cp. 1 Pet. 2²¹⁻²⁵). The evangelist prepares the way for this identification by the quotation in 1²³ from the opening section of the Servant prophecies (Isa. 40⁸).

³ Behind John lies Mark, for whom Jesus is both the Son (Ps. 2) and the Servant (Isa. 42¹); see Mark 1¹¹

⁴ 'By the Jewish doctors the Spirit hovering over the primeval waters (Gen. 1²) was compared to a dove' (Bernard, p. 49)

again 'from heaven'. For the descending Spirit has sanctified the waters of the new creation. Moreover, as the anointing of the Messiah with the Spirit 'abode *upon* him' (1³²),¹ so also it abides *in* us (1 John 2²⁷).

(ii) In 3⁶ a contrast is made between 'that which is begotten of the flesh' and 'that which is begotten of the Spirit'. This contrast throws light upon that of 1¹³. The reason for the contrast between human begetting and divine begetting is now seen to lie in the difference between flesh and Spirit. 'All flesh is grass'; so man is frail and mortal. In 1 Peter 1²³ this mortal frailty is contrasted with the living and abiding Word. Here, however, the contrast is with the Spirit of God. Now in the first creation 'the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul'.² Man is of the dust; but also he partakes of God's breath or Spirit. His seed is corruptible; but he may be begotten again of incorruptible seed. St. Paul, quoting Genesis 2⁷, contrasts 'the first man, Adam' who became a living soul 'with the last Adam who became a life-giving spirit'.³ Man is made for God, but cannot reach his goal apart from Christ, 'the second man' who is 'from heaven'.⁴ John 3^{6,7} teaches the corresponding truth concerning the Holy Spirit. Mortal man needs to be begotten from above, that is from the Spirit who descends out of heaven (1³²).

(iii) In verse 5 water and Spirit are *complementary*; in verse 6 flesh and Spirit are *contrasted*. In verse 8 wind and Spirit are *compared*. The purpose of this comparison is to develop the contrast of verse 6 more positively and so press home the unwavering insistence upon the necessity of re-birth from above (vv. 3, 5, 7). The word *pneuma* can mean 'wind' or 'spirit'; the first half of verse 8 is in fact so worded that it might refer to either. The sentence constitutes an allegory in which verbal comparison is unnecessary, because the two statements to be compared are verbally identical. The sentence has a double meaning: (i) 'The wind blows where it will, and thou hearest its sound'; (ii) 'The Spirit breathes where he will, and

¹ cp. Isa. 11², 61¹

² Gen. 2⁷

³ 1 Cor. 15⁴⁵. The meaning of *πνεῦμα ζωοποιούν* is considered later; see below, p. 267 and note 5 with refs. there given.

⁴ 1 Cor. 15⁴⁷; cp. John 3^{13, 31}

thou hearest his Voice.¹ The sentence continues: 'but knowest not whence it (he) comes and whither it (he) goes.' The pronoun does not appear in the Greek, so that this clause is the same with either meaning. The verse as a whole speaks about the Spirit in language suitable to wind.² So we may render it thus:

The Spirit breathes where he will, and thou hearest his voice but knowest not whence he comes and whither he goes;³ so is everyone that is begotten of the Spirit.

The word rendered 'will' indicates, not purpose, but spontaneity or freedom from constraint.⁴ The Spirit is his own law, as the wind seems to be. His activity is therefore unpredictable and mysterious. This completes the contrast of verse 6. The natural man is constrained and limited. The regenerate man is mysteriously free. He has entered upon a life which surpasses human understanding in its possibilities.

¹ The double rendering is taken from Bernard, p. 107

² conforming to the classic description of Pentecost in Acts 2²

³ cp. 8¹⁴; the 'whence' and 'whither' of the Spirit-begotten man conforms to the mystery of the Christ

⁴ The complementary truth is stated in 1 Cor. 12¹¹

PART II

THE DIVINE-HUMAN LIFE AND THE BODY
OF CHRIST

CHAPTER VIII

THE CONSECRATION OF THE CHURCH

The re-birth of the individual places him within that pentecostal event which was the re-birth of the messianic community.¹ That event in which the people of God, as such, was reborn is described in the Epistle to the Ephesians:

Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself up for it; that he might sanctify it, having cleansed it by the washing of water with the word, that he might present the church to himself a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish. (Eph. 5²⁵⁻²⁷)

Here the Church is represented as the bride of Christ receiving baptism at the hands of her bridegroom. This remarkable picture is inserted into a passage about family relationships in the Church, and in the immediate context of a section about husbands and wives. It is a prominent theme of this epistle that all human relationships are significant of higher mysteries. As every family is founded upon the fatherhood of God (3^{14,15}), so all family relationships are 'in the Lord' and subject to him. Mutual submission to one another in the fear of Christ is the rule. So wives are to submit themselves to their husbands as to the Lord; for a man is head of his wife as the Christ is head of the *ecclesia*, being himself saviour of the body (5²¹⁻²³). The last phrase takes us back from the bridal metaphor to that of the Body of Christ. But in this epistle the two conceptions are very closely connected. The key to this connexion lies in the present passage (5²²⁻³³), where the relation of head to body is clearly associated with the idea that a man is in some sense 'the head'

¹ see above, pp. 189-194

of his wife. This might, indeed, be implied in 1²², passing over, however, into the alternative theme in 1²³. For there the Church as the Body is the complement of Christ as the Head.¹

These two ways of speaking have two points in common. Head and body are mutually complementary; so are husband and wife. But the head has a controlling power over the body. So also the husband is the head of the family and the guardian and protector of his wife. In both of these ways the two types of language suitably represent the mutual relations of Christ and the Church. The second point is actually applied here in words which would fit either picture almost equally well. For Christ is Head of the Church and Saviour of the Body (v. 23); but also as Saviour of the Church he is head of the body. The head preserves the body from harm. The brain controls the limbs and saves them from accidents. So too the Head of the Church saves his members from destruction and from the disintegration which sin would cause apart from his saving grace.² But as the Church is subject to the Christ, so also wives are to be subject to their husbands in everything (v. 24). All through this section there is a play upon the double³ meaning of the word 'head'.

The starting-point of this language in St. Paul is to be sought in 1 Corinthians 11³, where we are told that the head of every man is the Christ, the head of a woman is the man, and the head of the Christ is God. The head here is the controlling power; and there is an ascending scale of such powers, running up from man through Christ to God. This thought, however, is not carried on into the illustration of the Body in 1 Corinthians 12.

This language about 'the head', and the closely connected language about 'one flesh' (Eph. 5^{23, 31}), goes back to the story of Adam and Eve (Gen. 2²⁰⁻³⁰). There we read that, whereas man was made of dust and the inbreathing of God's breath, woman was made out of a rib taken from man's side. When he sees her the man at once acknowledges her as his true helpmeet

¹ In Col. 1¹⁸ Christ is 'the head of the body, the church', because he is 'the beginning' (*ἀρχή*) of both creations; on this see further Chapter X. This aspect of 'the head' is, therefore, probably present in the thought of Ephesians also; cp. Eph. 1¹⁰, and see above, p. 178.

² For a correlative truth see above, pp. 94, 95

³ possibly triple in view of Col. 1¹⁸; see n. 1 on this page

in contrast to the animals; for 'she is bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh'. She is to be called Woman for the reason that 'she was taken out of Man'. Thus is explained the custom whereby a man leaves his parents and cleaves to his wife, 'and they become one flesh' (2²⁰⁻²⁴).¹ The next chapter relates how after their disobedience and expulsion from Paradise this ideal relationship is changed. The curse uttered in 3¹⁴⁻¹⁹ brings the woman under her husband's rule. Whereas she was his helpmeet, under the new conditions of sorrow and toil he becomes her head. Fellowship is now modified by dependence. Nevertheless the 'one flesh' continues to operate. The man's rule is not unconditioned. It is acceptable to the woman, because her 'desire' is towards her husband. This in turn is due to the fact that by her origin she partakes of his nature.

Now the prophets taught that Israel is the wife of Jehovah. Her children are his children. Jehovah chose their mother to be his bride, an act of condescending grace of which Israel was not worthy.² This marriage covenant is not represented as being based upon a community of nature between God and man in virtue of creation. It is not brought into relation with the story in Genesis 2²⁰⁻²⁴; nor again is it connected with the other version³ of creation in Genesis 1^{26, 27}. Its whole significance depends upon the contrast between a holy God and the sinful people whom he has chosen. He made them his by an act of undeserved favour. Yet it is also true that this contrast contains within itself a paradox. 'The high and lofty One that inhabiteth eternity, whose name is Holy' dwells 'with him also that is of a contrite and humble spirit' (Isa. 57¹⁵). He is far above the gods of the heathen; yet he is much nearer to his worshippers than such gods could ever be. Nature-worship offered a community of nature between gods and worshippers as its great attraction. The 'desire' of Israel was naturally towards these lovers (Hos. 2⁵). Yet for all that they remained the Baalim

¹ For the tenses in Gen. 2²⁴ see Driver (W), and Skinner (ICC), *ad loc.*

² Hos. 1-3, Jer. 3, Ezek. 16, 23, Isa. 54¹⁻⁸. The picture is not unified with the corresponding idea of adoption. Israel is God's son in Egypt (Hos. 11¹); yet the espousals were in the wilderness after the Exodus (Hos. 2¹⁵, Jer. 2²).

³ From 1 Cor. 11⁷⁻⁹ it is clear that St. Paul interpreted Gen. 1^{26, 27} in the light of Gen. 2²⁰⁻²⁴

(masters). But if Israel returns to her first espousals 'it shall be at that day, saith the Lord, that thou shalt call me Ishi (my husband); and shalt call me no more Baali (my master)'.¹ It is as though the relationship in Genesis 3¹⁶ has been replaced once more by that of the 'helpmeet' greeted by Adam in the previous chapter. One thing is lacking,—the 'one flesh'. That was provided by the Incarnation.

Accordingly in the New Testament our Lord appears in the rôle of the bridegroom, which in the Old Testament belonged to Jehovah. For the Messiah exercises divine functions as the author of the new creation. 'Thy maker is thy husband' is a statement which becomes wholly true as applied to the Christian Church.² In Mark 2¹⁹ our Lord claims the title of bridegroom for himself. His parables also speak of the eschatological crisis in terms of a marriage feast for a king's son. His prerogative as bridegroom is shared by no other, such as the Baptist (John 3²⁹) or St. Paul (2 Cor. 11^{2,3}). The last-mentioned passage suggests a contrast between the Church and Eve comparable to that developed elsewhere between Christ and Adam.³ So too Ephesians 5²¹⁻³³ is obviously coloured by the language and ideas of Genesis 2²⁰⁻³¹. Genesis 2²⁴ is quoted in full, in application to Christian marriage, in accordance with our Lord's use of it in Mark 10⁷ (v. 31). The following verse then declares that this statement ('the two shall be one flesh') has an inner meaning of high importance which refers to Christ and the Church (v. 32). The thought seems to be that the inspired record of Genesis concerning the divine institution of marriage contains a secret of much higher significance than is indicated in its literal meaning. The 'one flesh' shared by husband and wife symbolizes the 'one flesh' shared by Christ and the Church in virtue of the Incarnation.⁴

Christian marriage, therefore, although embodying the principle of the first creation (Gen. 2²⁴), is to find its true ana-

¹ Hos. 2¹⁶; see the exquisite conclusion which follows in vv. 17-23. For other O.T. references see Exod. 34¹⁴⁻¹⁶, Deut. 31¹⁶, Isa. 50¹, 62^{4,5}. Eph. 5²⁷ corresponds to the last of these.

² Isa. 54⁵. A full list of N.T. references is given by Bernard on John 3²⁹ (pp. 130, 131).

³ V. 3 quotes Gen. 3¹²

⁴ see above, p. 45, on Heb. 2¹⁴, 3¹⁴, which are quoted below, p. 226

logy in the relation of Christ to the Church. For only there, in the new creation, has the principle of the 'one flesh' been brought to its true fruition. Man is made for fellowship of the most intimate kind. The highest earthly example of this fact is human marriage. For this is the 'natural sacrament' of the common life. Man, however, was made for a higher and more intimate fellowship still. He was made for communion with God; and this end has been finally secured through the gracious condescension of God's Son.¹ So:

Husbands, love your wives, even as the Christ also loved the church and gave himself up for her.² (Eph. 5²⁵)

Christian marriage is not only to be modelled upon the mystical union of Christ and the Church. It is actually to partake of its quality. It is not only to exemplify and symbolize it, but also to embody it. The common life of husband and wife is to embody the divine-human *koinonia* of God and man in Christ. It is to be an 'effectual sign' of that divine-human *koinonia*, the earthly union being engraced with the graces which abound in the heavenly union. What those graces are is immediately declared in the same statement. 'The Messiah loved the *ecclesia* and gave himself up on her behalf.'

The verb used in the phrase rendered 'gave himself up'³ is also used by St. Paul in Galatians 2²⁰ in the phrase: 'loved me and gave himself up⁴ on my behalf'. In both cases the tense used refers to the historic event when Christ gave himself up to the death of the Cross. In Galatians 2²⁰ it is the active form corresponding to 'who was delivered up⁵ on account of our trespasses' in Romans 4²⁵. In the last named text our Lord is identified with the suffering Servant (Isa. 53). It seems probable that both the other texts have the same reference. Thus in Ephesians 5²⁵ our Lord as the Messiah is described as having exercised a double function. He is the divine bridegroom who

¹ see above, Chapter VI

² By dropping the article here (ὁ χριστός) and by referring to the Church as 'it' (for αὐτῆς, αὐτήν) RV greatly obscures the significance of this passage.

³ παρέδωκεν

⁴ παραδόντος

⁵ παρεδόθη; cp. also note 1 on p. 53

loved Israel his bride; but he is also 'Israel, my servant' (Isa. 41⁸). In the former rôle he performs divine functions, as the messianic king, on behalf of God towards Israel. In the latter rôle he performs human functions as Israel, on behalf of God towards mankind. But also in the rôle of the Servant he 'gave himself up' on behalf of mankind as a sacrificial victim; he poured out his soul unto death. It follows then that our Lord as the Messiah is Bridegroom, Victim and Priest in one. The sorrows of the divine bridegroom over his unfaithful bride are frequently described by the prophets¹ as the counterpart of his love. Both the love and the sorrow were fulfilled in the Passion of Jesus Christ.²

In the story of the first creation we are told that because Woman was 'taken out of Man' therefore a man leaves his home and cleaves to his wife, 'and they become one flesh.' In the new creation the Son of God left his heavenly home to cleave to his earthly bride. The creator became the bridegroom, not from affection arising out of a common nature, but because of the undeserved love which the creator has for his sinful creatures. In the first creation Adam became one flesh with her who was taken from his flesh. In the new creation the Son of God 'became flesh' that he might be the second Adam. Since we 'have become partakers of flesh and blood he also himself in like manner partook of the same' (Heb. 2¹⁴) that we might 'become partakers of' him (Heb. 3¹⁴). 'So also ought husbands to love their wives as their own bodies' (Eph. 5²⁸). For 'the husband is the head of the wife as also the Christ is head of the church, himself saviour of the body' (5²⁸). So the second Adam is Head of his Body and Bride, and loves her not only as her creator, but also as her saviour, who took her nature in order that in it he might save her. In loving her the incarnate Saviour loves himself (as the Head in loving the Body); 'for no man ever hated his own flesh' (5²⁹).

¹ Hosea in his family history enacted the part

² τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀγαπήσαντός με καὶ παραδόντος ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ in Gal. 2²⁰ corresponds exactly to ὁ χριστὸς ἠγάπησεν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν καὶ ἑαυτὸν παρέδωκεν ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς in Eph. 5²⁵. In both the messianic Son (Ps. 27) is described as the Lover who made himself a voluntary victim on behalf of man: in the former passage he is the object of individual Christian faith; in the latter his sacrificial love for the Church provides the exemplar and substance of Christian social life.

The divine bridegroom became a voluntary sacrificial victim on behalf of his bride in order that he might

consecrate her by cleansing her in the bath of baptism as she utters her confession, in order to have the church as his very own, standing before him in all her glory, with never a spot or wrinkle or any such flaw, but consecrated and unblemished.

(Eph. 5^{26, 27} M)

Dr. Moffatt's rendering of this passage makes clear several points which are obscure in older versions. Our Lord, once a victim on the Cross, but also then and now our high-priest,¹ solemnly consecrated the Church to be his own bride. The *ecclesia* which he so consecrated was the true Israel which had always existed since the promises were first given, notwithstanding the apostasy of 'Israel after the flesh'. In the light of what was said about re-birth in the last chapter, and particularly with regard to the teaching of John 1 and 3,² we may think of the act of cleansing and consecration as beginning at our Lord's own baptism and coming to its climax in the out-pouring of the Spirit at Pentecost. During that period the Messiah and his disciples (who with him constituted the true messianic community) entered and passed through the supreme eschatological crisis of re-birth. According to St. Matthew our Lord submitted to John's baptism because 'thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness' (3¹⁵). By this act he identified himself with sinners in *their* need of justification. In the voice from heaven which followed the baptism the Father justified his Son and Servant³ and thereby sealed with his approval the inauguration of the New Birth.

The Messiah was 'Israel, my Servant'; but also the *ecclesia* was Israel, the bride of Jehovah. Israel is the Messiah and his community, neither without the other. So both together passed through the crisis in which Israel became new. Nevertheless the Messiah administered baptism to his bride. He was the high-priest and she the neophyte. Here, as before, if we seek to assign a point-by-point correspondence between the messianic events and their consequent effects, we get into difficulties at

¹ see next paragraph, and more fully below, pp. 372ff

² especially John 1²⁹⁻³⁶; see above, pp. 216-219

³ cp. Isa. 50⁸, and see above, p. 56 with note 2

once.¹ In the New Testament we are taught that the fruits of the eschatological crisis were garnered like a harvest in a heavenly granary which is the background of our present earthly life. All that happened once for all in the gospel history is there in an eternal order and therefore also here on earth now. So our Lord is the heavenly Lamb and the regnant priest-king, although the event which those titles signify occurred once for all on Calvary. That event again was the central point of a crisis which extends backwards and forwards. So when Jesus came to be baptized by John he was already 'the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world'.²

Christ and his bride passed through the crisis together. Yet this 'togetherness' includes a contrast. She was, and ever remains, in dependence upon him. What happened to him has consequences in her. He gave himself up in order that he might cleanse and consecrate her. His self-donation constitutes her cleansing and consecration. Yet it is also the ground of her ever-renewed initiation. Thus on one occasion he spoke of the baptism which he must undergo in the near future, in reference to the coming crisis of the Passion.³ His reply to the brothers, James and John, on the occasion of their ambitious request, was: 'Ye know not what ye ask. Are ye able to drink the cup that I drink? or to be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with?'⁴ On both occasions the context is deeply charged with the atmosphere of a crisis which has sacrificial import.⁵ The thrones for which they asked on the basis of the promise in Matthew 19²⁸ were there assigned under the condition: 'ye which have followed me.' The implications of this condition are made clear in the Lucan parallel (Luke 22²⁴⁻³⁴), most of which follows immediately after the request of the two brothers in Mark and Matthew.⁶

¹ see above, Chapter II, pp. 56-65, Chapter IV, pp. 121-126, esp. p. 125, note 2. In Chapter VII the New Birth was shown to have this organic character.

² John 1²⁹, and so also 'the Servant' (Mark 1¹¹); see above, pp. 217, 218 and notes

³ Luke 12⁵⁰

⁴ Mark 10³⁸

⁵ e.g. the 'fire' of Luke 12⁴⁹ (cp. 3¹⁶); and the 'cup' of sacrifice in Mark takes its significance from the whole passage (10³²⁻⁴⁵)

⁶ Luke 22²⁴⁻³⁰ = Matt. 19²⁸ + Matt. 20²⁰⁻²⁸, (Mark 10³⁵⁻⁴⁵; cp. 9³³⁻³⁵)

The initiation of the Church was, then, an initiation into the sacrifice of the Christ. That sacrifice was, first of all, a reality to be accepted by faith, a mystery to be apprehended and appreciated, as the revelation of eternal wisdom. Secondly it was a life to be appropriated and assimilated as being the only true life of the Church. These two stages are distinct, although intimately connected. It is with the first of the two that we are at present concerned. This initiation of the Church into the mystery of Christ's sacrifice is symbolically set forth in the words and acts recorded by St. John in his account of Maundy Thursday night (John 13). The evangelist solemnly draws attention to the significance of what he is about to record by prefixing to it an explanatory prologue (13¹⁻³). Jesus acted at the appointed time, with full knowledge that the destined hour had struck, when he should 'depart out of this world to the Father', having in view not only his approaching sacrifice and its heavenly goal, but also the love which he bore to his own disciples. They were not of the world, sharing that characteristic with himself (17¹⁴). Yet they were in the world which he was leaving (cp. 17¹¹). So, having all this in view, he performed a symbolic act, which was like a last word to them before his death.

In this act 'he exhibited his love for them to the uttermost'¹ (13¹). Supper was going on and the devil had already suggested to Judas 'that he should deliver him up'.² Thus the predestined death of the Lamb of God was already being prepared. Events were moving swiftly towards both the institution of the Holy Eucharist and the treachery in the garden. Yet Jesus was not in the grip of fate. He was master of his own destiny. For he knew that 'the Father gave all things into his hand'. Moreover he knew the mystery of his own coming and going. In contrast to the Jews he knew the 'whence' and 'whither' of his messianic mission.³ What he now proceeds to do is done with deliberate purpose, as an act suitable to the whole meaning of

¹ Bernard, p. 455

² παραδοῖ; cp. v. 11 and 6⁶⁴. See also Mark 9³¹, 10³³, and see above, pp. 225, 226 and notes, on Eph. 5²⁵ and Gal. 2²⁰. Here also ἡγάπησεν is associated with the keyword from Isa. 53¹⁸. This word (παραδίδωμι) is repeated through the New Testament with the repetitive persistence of a tolling bell.

³ cp. 8¹⁴, 9^{29, 30}, and 3⁸, on which see above, p. 219 with n. 3

his mission and his Gospel. This lowly act is performed by Jesus 'with full consciousness of the majesty of his Person, and even because of it'.¹

The feet-washing was the act in which our Lord exhibited his love for the disciples to the uttermost. Our Lord himself explained it as providing his disciples with an example of lowly service (vv. 13-17). His humble ministry to them is the pattern of all Christian humility exhibited in ministries of the most menial kind. Such ministries have a grandeur and an exalted dignity which can be understood only by those who have taken into their hearts the truth that the Son of God 'came not to be ministered unto, but to minister and to give his life a ransom for many' (Mark 10⁴⁵). If we place the feet-washing after the dispute mentioned in Luke 22²⁴, it would represent a determined attempt on the part of our Lord to eradicate by an acted parable the self-seeking spirit which repeatedly casts a shadow over the Twelve.² It is in fact the link which is needed to connect Mark 10⁴⁵ with the institution of the Eucharist and all that follows it in the story of the Passion. As St. John tells the story, however, its original purpose as an example of humility is lifted into the wider setting of the Passion. It is not merely a link, but also a symbol of the Passion itself and of much that it signifies.

This wider meaning of the feet-washing can be seen in a number of details, which would be out of place if the incident were, for the evangelist, simply an acted parable of humility. (i) The solemn particularity of the short prologue (vv. 1-3) which ushers in this incident has already been noticed. If the incident has itself the wider significance here suggested, then verses 1-3 draw attention to the implications of the Passion story as a whole, or rather to the message of the whole gospel as set forth in its second part (chs. 13-21). It would follow that the feet-washing as an exhibition of love to the uttermost is a symbol of the whole revelation recorded in this gospel. (ii) Agreeable to the view just stated is the fact that in the course of 13¹⁻²⁰ there are a number of indications concerning the mystery of our Lord's Person. The clearest of these indications are in verses 1, 3 and 19. The last-mentioned verse contains the mysterious phrase: 'I am' with its implicit claim to deity.³

¹ Bernard, p. 456

² see above, p. 228

³ On *ἐγώ εἰμι* in the fourth gospel see Bernard, pp. cxvii-cxxi

(iii) Verses 18 and 19, however, also connect this claim with the Passion. The traitor is mentioned in verses 2, 11, 18; thus the way is prepared progressively for the open declaration of verse 21 with its consequent incidents issuing in the departure of the traitor into the 'night' (v. 30).

The undertones of the key-phrase: 'he was delivered up,'¹ are thus made to sound their persistent note throughout the story. Jesus washes the feet of Judas; we are not allowed to forget that. But further in these references to the traitor there is for St. John a deeper reason than the tragedy of Judas. The divine forecounsels are being majestically fulfilled. 'That the Scripture might be fulfilled' ushers in a quotation from Psalm 41⁹. The Passion to its last detail is foretold. Jesus is the suffering Messiah of whom all the Scriptures prophesy. Jesus seals their truth with his own prophetic words: 'I tell you now before it comes to pass, that, when it is come to pass, ye may believe that I am' (v. 19).² (iv) The implication of verses 18, 19 is that the truth of our Lord's claim to deity was revealed most clearly in the Passion itself, regarded as the fulfilment of the Old Testament Scriptures. Here we come very near to the innermost secret of the fourth gospel. It explains the peculiar way in which our Lord's sacrifice is referred to throughout the gospel, above all in the allusion to the brazen serpent (3¹⁴) and in the fuller explanation with which the first part closes (12²⁰⁻⁵⁰). To this wider reference we shall return. For the present it is sufficient to note that for the evangelist the feet-washing is not simply a parable of Christian humility, an acted sermon on Christian character, but rather a parable of glory in humiliation as revealed in the Passion itself. In other words the example of humility which our Lord teaches explicitly (vv. 13-16) issues in a beatitude upon lowly service (v. 17) precisely because the example itself issues from a great theological mystery, the mystery of that great glory which this gospel finds in the Cross.

(v) Lastly this narrative, whilst explicitly occupied with a parable of lowly service merging into a deeper parable of the Passion, also contains clear indications of something else besides which connects it with Ephesians 5²⁵⁻²⁷. The conversation with Simon Peter about washing (vv. 6-10) recalls a synoptic parallel (Mark 8³⁰⁻³⁸). There the teaching that the Messiah must suffer,

¹ see note 2 on p. 229 above.

² cp. RV margin

introduced for the first time, called forth a rebuke from Peter. This in turn called forth a stinging reply ('Get thee behind me, Satan') and a fuller statement of the law of sacrifice. So here the disciple's unpreparedness for the example of humility and his instinctive expostulation: 'Lord, dost *thou* wash *my* feet?' calls forth a fuller revelation, given through the medium of a rebuke. 'If I wash thee not, thou hast no part with me' (v. 8) introduces a new thought. Verses 8-11 contain a subtle play on the double meaning of cleansing, bodily and spiritual. Finally the spiritual cleansing is linked with the Passion by the statement that it does not include the traitor. Once again, for the evangelist the foot-washing symbolizes the initiation of the disciples into the mystery of the Passion through which they are to be cleansed from sin. Thus it has a connexion with the revelation of the Lamb of God at the Baptism (1²⁹⁻³⁶), and therefore also with the teaching of 3¹⁻¹⁵, which culminates in the uplifting of the Son of man upon the Cross.

The fourth gospel therefore gives the clue to the meaning of Ephesians 5²⁵⁻²⁷. From the standpoint which we are now considering the whole fourfold gospel may be read as the story of the initiation of the Church into the Passion of the Messiah, the story of her initiation into that crisis through which her own cleansing and consecration took place. Now baptism is the sacrament of initiation; and clearly the language of Ephesians 5²⁶ refers to a baptismal rite. Of that rite as practised in the early Church we have a detailed account in *The Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus. Two features stand out in the record: (1) The emphasis laid upon the candidate's confession of faith, and (2) the close connexion of this confession with the act of baptism itself. The faith of the neophyte is evoked by the ministers of the sacrament through the 'interrogatory creed'. The three questions into which the creed is divided and their corresponding answers are in each case the immediate prelude to an act of immersion. Thus the faith of the candidate is literally interlaced with the threefold act of baptism. The order in each case is: question, answer, immersion; or again: challenge, confession, initiation.¹ Similarly the difficult

¹ For details see *Texts and Studies*, ed. JAR, vol. viii (Cambridge 1916), no. 4: *The so-called Egyptian Church Order*, by Dom R. H. Connolly, Appendix B, pp. 183-185; also *The Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus*, ed. B. S.

phrase¹ in 1 Peter 3²¹ must refer to the questions put to the candidate,—questions which elicited the fact that he came to baptism with a good conscience, that is, with sincere repentance and faith.² The candidate came with genuine desire and earnest prayer that his conscience (because of its sincerity) might be cleansed from dead works through the resurrection of Jesus Christ to serve the living God.³

Between 1 Peter and Hippolytus comes the *Apology* of St. Justin Martyr, which emphasizes the fact that in baptism we dedicated ourselves to God. This is followed by a description of the initiation, in which faith, promise of obedience and prayer for forgiveness are prominent. Baptism is in the name of the Trinity. Finally 'this washing is called Enlightenment,⁴ because those who learn these things have their understanding enlightened'.⁵ St. Justin does not mention the interrogatory creed (he is addressing a pagan emperor); but he lays stress upon all those factors, subjective and objective, for which it stands. We may fairly conclude therefore that in Ephesians 5²⁶ the description of cleansing 'by the washing of water with the word'⁶ refers not only to what was said and done by the minister of baptism, but also to what was said by the candidate. In other words the expression 'with the word' at least includes some response from the candidate, such as would be represented by a confession of faith in answer to a challenge or demand in the form of questions.⁷ Dr. Moffatt's translation⁸ makes this point clear.

Easton (Cambridge 1934), pp. 46, 47; and *The Treatise on the Apostolic Tradition of St. Hippolytus of Rome*, ed. Dom Gregory Dix, vol. i (SPCK, 1937), pp. 36, 37.

It is to be noticed that, whereas this rite lays the maximum emphasis upon the confession of faith, it allows that confession, in the case of children who cannot answer for themselves, to be made for them by their parents or by one of their family.

¹ συνειδήσεως ἀγαθῆς ἐπερώτημα

² On the whole subject there is a useful contribution by G. W. Blenkin in his commentary (CGT), p. 81; see also MM, pp. 231, 232

³ The last sentence interprets 1 Pet. 3²¹ (and 1³) in the light of Heb. 9¹⁴

⁴ φωτισμός; cp. the description of the ἀπαξ φωτισθέντας in Heb. 6^{4, 5}

⁵ Justin, *Apology* I, 61; the quotation in English is taken from H. M. Gwatkin's *Selections from early Christian writers*, p. 51

⁶ ἐν ῥήματι

⁷ The interpolation in Acts 8³⁷ represents the same liturgical tradition

⁸ see above, p. 227

Moreover the rendering: 'as she utters her confession' corresponds exactly to the procedure described in *The Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus. For although each of the three immersions follows the confession of faith to which it corresponds, this effects an actual interlacing of confessions and immersions.

Challenge, confession, initiation: these three words correspond to a threefold process which recurs in the gospel story. We are concerned especially with the forms which it takes in the period falling between the Baptism of Jesus and the outpouring of the Spirit at Pentecost. This period also corresponds particularly to the apostolic witness and preaching,¹ which in Acts is so closely connected with the *koinonia*.² Much of the story takes the form of question and answer. Problems of faith are raised and dealt with stage by stage, each stage leading on to fuller initiation. We may begin by noticing these characteristics of the process as set forth by St. John in that early part of his gospel which seems to hinge upon the Baptist's witness to the meaning of our Lord's baptism. We shall then be concerned with the foundations of the process, and finally with the process of initiation itself and its permanent laws.

(I) Immediately after the prologue in St. John's Gospel the Baptist comes upon the stage to give his 'witness'. This witness is given in reply to an official deputation from Jerusalem. He has to submit to a deluge of questions about himself and his mission. His reply turns the questioners away from himself to Another. He points to the Lamb of God, and records the sign which designates the Messiah's person and mission. This witness constitutes a challenge which sends two of his own disciples away to Jesus (vv. 35ff). The Lord confronts them immediately with the challenging question: 'What seek ye?' They are not yet ready to accept that challenge. They do not know what they seek; but seekers they are, and their own question indicates that fact. It is sufficient answer for the present;

¹ as defined in Acts 1^{21, 22}, in contrast to the wider scope of *τῇ διδασκῇ τῶν ἀποστόλων* (Acts 2⁴²); see also C. H. Dodd, *The Apostolic Preaching and its developments*.

² e.g. Acts 10²⁸⁻⁴⁸. In 1 John 1¹⁻⁴ the *κοινωνία* is, in its human aspect, *κοινωνία μεθ' ἡμῶν*, that is, with the eye-witnesses of the facts, because the facts are the foundation of the *κοινωνία* in the Church.

it calls forth the invitation: 'Come, and ye shall see.' The invitation carries with it a promise of vision. The call spreads from one to another and draws out the question: 'Can any good thing come out of Nazareth?'¹ The shrewd reply of his friend leads Nathanael to Jesus. At once he is confronted with a challenging greeting which elicits the question: 'Whence knowest thou me?' So the process goes on.

But questions also come from outside the inner circle, as at the beginning (1¹⁹). A challenge to official Judaism in the temple courts brings out the hostile question: 'What sign shewest thou unto us, seeing that thou doest these things?' (2¹⁸). To such a question there could be no plain verbal answer. The answer given was itself a challenging revelation. It baffled the questioners. But, like the act which called forth the question (vv. 14-16), it was as a living seed (Luke 8¹¹). It sank into the minds of the disciples to be afterwards remembered (v. 17). The seed was destined one day to bear fruit (vv. 19-22). Sometimes the seeker's questions indicate a barrier which cannot be passed. He is anxious to go forward, but the way is blocked (3^{4,9}). The barrier is due to limitations in the seeker's mind, which he himself cannot remove, no matter how much he may desire it. This belongs to the essential character of human faith, when confronted with the Gospel. In so far as it is our own activity, it can do nothing. It is held up by apparently insurmountable barriers.

(II) Yet there is a way across these barriers, as our Lord indicated in his classic definition of faith. The foundations of the process of initiation are set forth in these words:

Have faith in God. Verily I say unto you, Whosoever shall say unto this mountain,² Be thou taken up and cast into the sea; and shall not doubt in his heart, but shall believe that what he saith cometh to pass; he shall have it. (Mark 11^{22, 23})

This definition provides a standard by which all descriptions of human faith may be tested. After the same pattern is St. Paul's description of the faith of Abraham, that is to say, the faith with which the patriarch responded to the promises of God

¹ cp. the ironic by-play in 7⁴¹⁻⁴³

² The preceding context (11¹¹⁻²¹) shows that 'this mountain' is Mount Zion whose destruction is there foreshadowed

concerning his seed: 'Looking unto the promise of God, he wavered not through unbelief, but waxed strong through faith, giving glory to God' (Rom. 4²⁰). This, as the context shows, was faith in God's power to work a miracle comparable to that of raising the dead to life. For St. Paul the birth of Isaac was a type of our Lord's resurrection.¹ The promise was ushered in through a birth which prefigured the New Birth through death and resurrection.

The pattern of Abraham's faith was also reproduced in her through whom the New Creation became actual. At the beginning of the gospel story stands the record of Mary's response to the message of the Annunciation (Luke 1²⁶⁻³⁸). The promise to Abraham was fulfilled through the most wonderful of all human births. This Birth does not merely prefigure the New Birth. It is its necessary foundation.² It is also the foundation of that pattern of faith which our Lord defined (Mark 11^{22, 23}) and which we are now considering. In St. Luke's story the Annunciation to Mary is in clear contrast to the preceding narrative of an angelic announcement to Zacharias. Both stories have a literary connexion with the promise of Isaac's birth as set forth in Genesis 17, 18. Zacharias doubted the angel's word on the ground of the advanced age of himself and his wife (Luke 1¹⁸⁻²⁰). For exactly the same reason 'Abraham fell upon his face and laughed' and even prayed that the promise might come through Ishmael (Gen. 17¹⁵⁻¹⁸). The divine reply to this appears to be represented as satisfying Abraham; for he does what he is told without further question (17¹⁹⁻²⁷). In the next chapter the promise is repeated in the hearing of Sarah (18¹⁻¹⁵). Now Abraham's doubts pass to his wife. The laugh is repeated for the same reasons. But here the reply is in a tone of rebuke. The laugh, it would seem, was a sign, not simply of doubt but of unbelief. The thing is impossible! To this there comes the reply: 'Is anything too hard³ for the Lord?' (18¹⁴). In the Greek Bible this is represented by: 'Is anything impossible with God?'⁴ In the story of the Annunciation this saying is taken up and turned into a positive

¹ For details see above, pp. 52, 53, and below, pp. 275ff

² cp. the Collect for Christmas Day in the Book of Common Prayer

³ RV margin: 'wonderful'

⁴ μή ἀδυνατεῖ παρὰ τῷ θεῷ ῥῆμα; (Gen. 18¹⁴ LXX)

affirmation: 'From God no word (or thing)¹ shall be impossible.'²

When the narrative of Luke 1²⁶⁻³⁸ is compared with the stories of Genesis 17, 18 and Luke 1⁵⁻²³ it becomes clear that the evangelist seeks to represent the faith and response of Mary as standing alone without flaw. There are three well-marked stages in the whole scene as set forth by St. Luke: (i) The angelic greeting: 'The Lord is with thee' causes a troubled state and sets up a reasoning process about the significance of the greeting. The greeting is a challenge which creates a questioning attitude: 'What does this mean?' (vv. 28, 29). (ii) The disturbance of mind is met with words of re-assurance (v. 30); and the questioning attitude is answered with a detailed revelation of God's purpose. Challenge and question are followed up by a word of the Lord declaring God's will (vv. 31-33). This revelation calls forth from Mary a question. The question expresses no doubt about the substance of the message. It is the one legitimate question: 'How shall this be?' (v. 34).³ (iii) The answer to this question is a further revelation declaring the divine method of operation. This second revelation carries the initiation of Mary into the mystery further by explaining the miraculous character of the promised birth, and also by announcing the divine sonship to which the miracle corre-

¹ ῥῆμα in biblical Greek can mean 'word' or 'thing'. Here 'word' seems more probable (see next note).

² Luke 1³⁷. For the rendering of this saying see F. Field, *Notes on the Translation of the New Testament* (Cambridge 1899), pp. 46, 47. See also Plummer (ICC), *ad loc.*, pp. 25, 26; cp. also MM on ἀδυνατέω (p. 10²).

In the text above Gen. 17 and 18 have been accepted as they now stand, making one continuous narrative. For in this form they were used by New Testament writers (e.g. St. Paul and St. Luke). Originally they represented two different ways of accounting for Isaac's name. The earlier narrative in ch. 18 attributes this to his mother's laughter. The later in ch. 17 assigns the laughter to the father. This puts the author in difficulties about Abraham's faith, of the high commendation of which, recorded in 15⁶, he was presumably aware. He therefore interprets the laugh as one of surprise, rather than of unbelief. See Skinner (ICC), p. 295, on Gen. 17¹⁷. For further literary connexions of Gen. 18¹⁴ in O.T. see Job 42³, Zech. 8⁶ and Jer. 32^{17, 27} (Hebrew and LXX); for the Greek of the last of these texts see Plummer's note on Luke 1³⁷.

³ Plummer quotes from St. Ambrose, who is contrasting Mary with Zacharias: 'Haec jam de negotio tractat; ille adhuc de nuntio dubitat'

sponds (v. 35). Two more points are added. The first is an aid to faith. The wonderful birth of the Baptist, soon to take place, is an indication of God's power already at work (v. 36). Finally the whole revelation is clinched with the Old Testament reference, which would carry Mary's mind back to the wonderful birth of Isaac, but which had other scriptural associations with God's power and with the faith of his people in that power.¹ So the angel concludes: 'For from God no word shall be impossible' (v. 37).² To this there comes the immediate reply: 'Behold the handmaid of the Lord; be it unto me according to thy word' (v. 38).

The response of Mary is a submission to God's will, rendered possible by the conviction that the power of God is equal to his declared purpose. There can be no gap between the two, because the word of God is creative. What that word utters must have reality. It cannot be void or empty, because it proceeds from the living God. Nothing is too hard for the Lord; and Christ declares that nothing is too hard for the believer in the Lord. 'Have faith in God' (Mark 11²²) and his almighty power will be at your disposal. This connexion between the divine power and the faith of the believer comes out very clearly in a passage which records our Lord's saying about faith in a somewhat different form:

Verily I say unto you, If ye have faith as a grain of mustard seed, ye shall say unto this mountain, Remove hence to yonder place; and it shall remove; and nothing shall be impossible unto you. (Matt. 17²⁰)

Our Lord's definition of faith appears altogether in three or four distinct forms in the synoptic gospels; it was also apparently known to St. Paul (1 Cor. 13²). Its historicity is therefore firmly grounded. The quotation just made from St. Matthew gives the only passage in which this definition is explicitly connected with the saying about God's power. The saying in question seems to appear first in Genesis 18¹⁴ and, as we have seen, re-appears elsewhere in the Old Testament. It provides the climax to the story of the Annunciation; and St. Matthew's Gospel connects

¹ see *reff.* at the end of note 2 on p. 237 above, and also below, p. 240, note 4

² cp. also Isa. 55¹¹: 'my word . . . shall not return unto me void', etc.

it explicitly with our Lord's teaching about faith. But it is implicit also in the metaphor of the uprooted mountain,¹ and just as truly in the alternative metaphor of the uprooted tree (Luke 17⁶).² The latter saying was called forth by a direct request of the disciples: 'Lord, increase our faith' (v. 5). Our Lord answers their request strangely enough by giving a definition of faith which sets it completely beyond the range of human capacity. But this was just what they needed. A sense of spiritual need was awakening in them. This must be deepened in order that they might seek the satisfaction of that need in God. Accordingly the Marcan form of the saying is coupled with an exhortation to prayer: 'Therefore I say unto you, All things whatsoever ye pray and ask for, believe that ye have received them, and ye shall have them.'³

This connexion of true faith with prayer is well illustrated by the story of the healing-miracle which followed the Transfiguration.⁴ There both are related to the power of God as manifested in our Lord's 'mighty works'.⁵ The father's request: 'If thou canst do anything' receives the reply: 'If thou canst! All things are possible to him that believeth.' The man's answer to this challenge: 'I believe; help thou my unbelief,' is at once a confession of faith and a penitent prayer acknowledging the defects of his faith. Our Lord's comment afterwards interprets the healing which he wrought: 'This kind can come out by nothing save by prayer.' The mighty work was conditioned by a response of faith which was both a prayer and an act of whole-hearted self-committal in trust to the Lord. By the prayer of faith the impossible became possible. St. Luke concludes his account of this incident with the comment: 'They were all astonished at the majesty of God.'⁶ St. Matthew follows St. Mark in emphasizing the human conditions under which the majesty of God is manifested. It is here that he inserts his own

¹ Mark 11²³ = Matt. 21²¹; cp. Ps. 46¹⁻³ and Rev. 8⁸. Moving mountains appear in Hos. 10⁸, Luke 23³⁰, Rev. 6¹⁶, where they indicate the absurdity of trying to escape divine judgement.

² 'The mountain' and 'the tree' are deeply connected in St. Mark's narrative (11¹⁻²⁴)

³ Mark 11²⁴ = Matt. 21²²

⁴ Mark 9¹⁴⁻²⁹ = Matt. 17¹⁴⁻²⁰ = Luke 9³⁷⁻⁴³

⁵ *δυνάμεις*; cp. Mark 6^{5,6}, where our Lord is said to have been able to do no *δύναμιν* in his own country on account of 'their unbelief'

⁶ Luke 9⁴³: *μεγαλειότης*

peculiar version of the saying about faith which has been quoted above.¹

In St. Mark's account of the saying (Mark 11²³ = Matt. 21²¹) it is emphatically laid down that the faith which is to move 'this mountain' must be free from the wavering uncertainty of doubt.² This corresponds to the whole-hearted trust expressed in the confession of faith just considered (Mark 9²⁴). The man acknowledges the poverty of his faith in the very moment when he gives evidence of its simple integrity. Now in Matthew 17²⁰ this condition of the soul is strikingly expressed in the phrase: 'if ye have faith as a grain of mustard seed'. The seed of faith may be very small, 'less than all the seeds that are upon the earth'; yet when this seed is sown it 'groweth up, and becometh greater than all the herbs' (Mark 4³⁰⁻³²). The mustard-seed produces results out of all proportion to its small size. 'So is the realm of God'; and so also is the faith which submits to the rule of that realm. The simple lowliness of faith is in inverse proportion to the majesty of God with whose power it becomes linked. So the majesty of God's power becomes manifested through the weakness of the believer.³

Such faith draws its strength from the living God, in whom it trusts. Faith trusts the word of One who has made himself known in his marvellous works of creation, redemption and judgement.⁴ The word of God is accepted because it cannot be in vain, since God is no vain thing like the idols. Nothing is too difficult,

¹ p. 238

² διακριθῆ; cp. the wavering uncertainty of the double-minded in Jas. 1⁶, and the unwavering directness of heavenly wisdom in Jas. 3¹⁷. St. Paul describes the faith of Abraham as unwavering (Rom. 4²⁰: οὐ διεκρίθη).

³ cp. 1 Cor. 1¹⁸⁻³⁰

⁴ The Hebrew word פֶּלֶא' (= 'is too hard'), in Gen. 18¹⁴ and Jer. 32^{17, 27}, is from the same root as נִפְלְאוֹת (= 'marvellous works', i.e. of God in creation, redemption and judgement; cp. Judges 6¹³); see under נִפְלְאָה in BDB, p. 810². A summary of these 'marvellous works' is given in Jer. 32¹⁷⁻²³. Jer. 32 declares that nothing is too hard for God, because he is creator of heaven and earth (v. 17) and the only God (v. 27). In a note on this passage S. R. Driver says: 'The idea of the Hebrew word is *separate* from the ordinary, *exceptional*; and so either *wonderful* or *difficult*' (*The Book of the Prophet Jeremiah*, ed. 1906, p. 197 n). RV margin gives as alternatives to 'hard', at Gen. 18¹⁴: 'marvellous' and at Jer. 32¹⁷: 'wonderful'.

if it comes from God. For the possibilities of faith are the possibilities of God. This is the faith of Luke 1^{37, 38}, and it is the faith of the childlike in heart (Matt. 18¹⁻⁴) who have entrance into the kingdom of heaven. It is the presupposition of initiation; and in the Johannine writings it is the counterpart of the new birth (John 1¹²; 1 John 5¹). But, as we have seen, its dependence upon the word of God (Luke 1³⁷) is interpreted in the fourth gospel to mean for Christians dependence upon the incarnate Word.¹ Faith in God, in its full Christian meaning, is faith in the Son of God incarnate. St. Paul defines it when he says: 'I live in faith, the faith which is in the Son of God, who loved me and gave himself up for me' (Gal. 2²⁰). So the difficulties of Nicodemus about the new birth are met by the statement: 'As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up: that whosoever believeth may in him have eternal life' (John 3^{14, 15}). The Church is initiated 'as she utters her confession' in the incarnate Word lifted up upon the Cross for her salvation.

(III) The process of initiation which we see in the gospel story is a work which cannot be realized in a day. The gospels show us the nucleus of the true Israel, the destined bride of Christ passing by stages through a difficult ordeal. It was indeed a veritable baptism, a partaking of our Lord's own baptism.² For baptism means a plunging beneath the waters of death and a rising again to new life.³ St. Luke prefixes to his account of the process the story of the miraculous draught of fishes (5¹⁻¹¹). The significant dialogue of verses 4 and 5 is followed by the miracle, whereby St. Peter is brought to a recognition of the majesty of Jesus.⁴ Through the miracle there came to him a revelation about his Master, which affected him as Isaiah had been affected by his vision in the temple.⁵ So he cried out: 'Depart from me; for I am a sinful man' (v. 8). The call of Peter (vv. 10, 11) was grounded upon a penitential confession, even as it was to issue later in his great confession of faith.⁶

The plan of St. Mark's Gospel seems to be largely determined by the process of initiation which we are considering. The process becomes particularly prominent from chapter 4 onwards.

¹ see above, pp. 210-212

² cp. Rom. 6¹⁻¹¹

³ Isa. 6⁵

⁴ see above, p. 228

⁵ cp. Luke 9⁴³ and *θάμβος* in 5⁹

⁶ Mark 8²⁹ and parallels

There we hear of 'the secret of the kingdom of God' (4¹¹) committed to the disciples, but not to those who are without. This is due to the selective character of the process. The word of God is like seed which enters human hearts with varying results according to the nature of the soil. In some the word is able to take root and to create a response of faith. Although the process is in accordance with divinely pre-ordained laws, no attempt is made to interfere with the soil. Each man is free to respond or not. So it was with all our Lord's teaching. Men were invited to hear; but none was compelled to listen or to respond. For that is the law of the New Birth. Initiation is free from constraint, because freedom is of the essence of the Spirit-begotten life and the faith which accompanies it.¹ So too our Lord's teaching was full of appeals to men to think for themselves with open minds. This method was in accordance with Israel's whole tradition. The prophets argued with men and appealed to facts. The Old Testament is full of questionings and even complaints concerning the problems of faith. Men whose national literature contained books like Job and Ecclesiastes were not likely to accept teaching without question.

Not only words, but also works bear witness; for the works of Jesus were embodiments of his creative word. The signs of God's kingdom were there for men to see; but the disciples were slow of understanding. Spiritual vision and hearing came slowly (Mark 8¹⁸; cp. 7³¹⁻³⁷, 8²²⁻²⁶) until at last the seed bore fruit. On St. Mark's testimony the initiation of the Twelve must have been at times somewhat like the conduct of a not over-bright catechism. 'How many basketsful took ye up?' 'Twelve . . . seven,' replies the class. 'Do ye not yet understand?' is the comment of the Teacher (8¹⁹⁻²¹). The slowness of the process is in accordance with indications given in the parables of sowing. There are many natural hindrances to the growth of faith. An enemy is at work hindering the harvest, and there are human influences in opposition. It is not easy to ignore the dead weight of opposition from an official tradition, especially when faith is left free and the overwhelming sign demanded is refused (8¹¹⁻¹³). Moreover our Lord used another illustration which throws light upon the slowness of the process. Sand can easily be shifted; but for that reason it will not stand firm against

¹ see above, p. 219

storms, just as wax can easily take an impression, but is too brittle to endure a strain. Rock is slow to take visible impression. It cannot easily be moved. Its shape cannot readily be altered. It may indeed, under strain, show cracks or fissures. But it is good material upon which to build. So the foundations of the Church were securely laid.¹

In due course the catechism class is ripe for higher teaching. A parallel has already been drawn between the feet-washing and the events near Caesarea Philippi.² The parallel extends not only to the dialogue between our Lord and St. Peter, but also to the whole sequence of events as interpreted by the evangelists. The momentous questions which begin at Mark 8²⁷ mount up to the crucial challenge which calls forth the decisive confession of faith. 'Thou art the Messiah' sums up the apostolic creed, as expressed in the first preaching of the Gospel. 'Jesus is the Messiah', 'Jesus is Lord', contained in germ all that later creeds have said. There was however one momentous difference between the Confession of St. Peter and all subsequent Christian confessions of faith. It comes out clearly in St. Paul's statement concerning the primitive form of baptismal creed, which appears to have been used for converts in his time:

The word³ is nigh thee, in thy mouth, and in thy heart: that is, the word³ of faith, which we preach: because if thou shalt confess with thy mouth Jesus as Lord, and shalt believe in thy heart that God raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved: for with the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation. (Rom. 10⁸⁻¹⁰)

The outward confession of faith corresponds to and expresses the inward conviction of the heart. That was as true for the Church at Caesarea Philippi as it is for every Christian. For unlike the righteousness of the law Christian justification depends upon faith which is vitally concerned with internal dispositions of the heart (Rom. 10¹⁻⁸). But this inward conviction must come to outward expression. It is 'as she utters her confession' that the Church is consecrated by cleansing; and therefore 'with the mouth confession is made unto salvation'. The way of salvation is one by which the inwardness of faith is

¹ Matt. 7²⁴⁻²⁷; cp. 16^{17, 18}

² John 13; Mark 8^{27ff} and parallels. See above, pp. 231, 232.

³ τὸ ῥῆμα

expressed in an outward order. All this was as true then as now; and therefore the Church is built upon the Confession of St. Peter. None the less St. Paul's statement reveals one immense difference. For the Church of his day the confession: 'Jesus is Lord'¹ implied not only the lordship of Jesus, but also the facts upon which faith in that lordship was founded. It meant believing in the 'heart that God raised him from the dead'.

The initiation of the Church at Caesarea Philippi bears a relation to Christian baptism and all that it signifies and implies, to which there is a familiar parallel. It is like the relation of the first Eucharist on the night of our Lord's betrayal to all subsequent Christian Eucharists. In each case the difference lies in the historical relation to the facts of our Lord's death and resurrection. The initiation of the Twelve came before the messianic events. Ours follows after. It must however be added that their initiation also extended over the events and was completed only at Pentecost. What St. John compresses into the single scene of the feet-washing is by St. Mark spread over the second half of his gospel. From another point of view, however, we might say that both evangelists follow fundamentally the same method. For the feet-washing introduces the great discourse, which is itself a vital part of the initiation. If the Lord cleansed the feet of his disciples in literal fact, he also declared a little later: 'Already ye are clean because of the word that I have spoken unto you' (John 15³).

Similarly the wider initiation in St. Mark's Gospel is also symbolized in the brief process which began with the questions at Caesarea Philippi and which reached its climax in the Transfiguration. As the Church utters her confession she is plunged at once into the mystery of the Passion. St. Peter is shocked by the prediction of sufferings and rejection, death and resurrection. He shudders under this douche of cold water as he descends into the baptismal flood. Moreover there is no escape from the path of sacrifice indicated in our Lord's words: 'For whosoever shall be ashamed of me and of my words in this adulterous and sinful generation, the Son of man also shall be ashamed of him, when he cometh in the glory of his Father with the holy angels'

¹ cp. 1 Cor. 12³ and the alternative reading in Rom. 10⁹ (RV margin and WH text)

(Mark 8³⁸). Israel after the flesh was an unfaithful bride. The true Church belongs to a Bridegroom who must tread the path of the suffering Servant. To refuse this path is to part company with him. Those who do not enter with him into the eschatological crisis must expect the judgement which falls upon those who remain *without*. The parallel between the two evangelists becomes clear once more. To be ashamed of Christ's sacrificial words is to cause shame to the Son of Man and to be involved in the judgement of separation from him and from his coming glory. That is the negative side of the picture. In the allegory of the True Vine St. John gives the corresponding positive truth. Jesus is the True¹ Vine, that is, the true Israel. Those who are branches of this Vine are subjected to all the tender care of the divine Husbandman. But to be *within* involves submitting to a pruning and cleansing process. There can be no fruit-bearing except by genuine branches of the Vine, nor genuine branches which do not bear fruit. Moreover, there can be no continuous fruit-bearing in the Vine unless the pruning and cleansing is always going on. For just as we cannot disown Christ's words of sacrifice without shaming him, so we cannot continue partakers of his life, except we be continuously cleansed by the word which he has spoken to us. On the other hand through his words abiding in us the Father is glorified by our fruit-bearing (John 15¹⁻⁸).

Thus there is no going backward and escaping judgement. On the other hand there is no going forward and escaping sacrifice. But the sacrifice leads to glory of which we are to be made partakers. After the plunge into the baptismal flood there is the rising to new life. After the Passion comes the Resurrection; so after the prediction of the Passion comes the Transfiguration. This great event tempered the rigours of the cold plunge, and intimated prophetically its glorious issue. Within the lifetime of some of his hearers our Lord predicts that they will 'see the kingdom of God come with power' (Mark 9¹). The initiatory process comes to its climax in vision and enlightenment. Each of the synoptists has his own view of the mystery. For all, of course, it declares the true significance of Peter's confession in the light of the intervening prediction. The Messiah fulfils the Law and the Prophets through suffering and glory. For St.

¹ i.e. genuine

Mark our Lord is simply the Beloved Son. Like Isaac¹ he is the true heir of the promised inheritance. But he is destined soon to be cast out of that inheritance, and to suffer the sacrificial death which Isaac was spared.² St. Matthew unites the thought of God's love for his Son with the thought of his delight in his Servant who is so soon to suffer.³ St. Luke characteristically introduces the word 'exodus' into the conversation with Moses and Elijah. For this evangelist our Lord is primarily the redeemer. The witnesses of the old covenant, which was enacted at the older 'mount of God'⁴, acknowledge at the new mount the new 'exodus' by which the true Redeemer will once more lead Israel out of Egypt and fulfil at Jerusalem the whole story of the first exodus. 'The church in the wilderness'⁵ came to the old law from a baptism 'into Moses in the cloud and in the sea'.⁶ Now once more the Church comes 'into the cloud', and is bidden to hear the new law from the Son who is also the elect Servant.⁷

St. John says nothing of the Transfiguration, or rather he spreads its glory over his whole gospel. For him the eye-witnesses of Christ's majesty beheld throughout the whole earthly life of the Lord a revelation of glory such as the only Son receives from his Father.⁸ In St. Mark's Gospel (8³⁸) our Lord points forward to the future glory of the Son of Man. A foretaste of his glory is given to the three disciples, authenticated as the glory of the Messiah by the witness of Moses and Elijah. For St. John, however, the Son of Man came down from heaven bringing this glory with him (3¹³).⁹ For it is the glory of the only-begotten Son which he had with the Father before the world was (1¹⁴, 17⁵). The Son of Man does not have to wait for his glory.¹⁰ In the discourse of chapter 5 he is described as exercising his characteristic function as judge here and now in his earthly life (vv. 22, 27). For the word which he speaks sets in motion a present process of judgement whether for life or for death (vv. 24, 25). For those whose eyes were opened by Christ (9⁵⁻⁷) he was the Light of the world (8¹²); and therefore while he was in the world

¹ Gen. 22^{2, 12, 16}, where Isaac is called the 'only' or 'beloved' son

² Mark 9¹², 12¹⁻⁹

³ Matt. 17⁵; cp. 3¹⁷, 12¹⁸ and Isa. 42¹

⁴ 1 Kings 19⁸

⁵ Acts 7³⁸

⁶ 1 Cor. 10^{1, 2}

⁷ Luke 9^{34, 35}

⁸ John 1¹⁴; cp. 2 Pet. 1¹⁰

⁹ cp. also the 'opened heaven' in 1⁵¹

¹⁰ although he must wait to be 'glorified' (7³⁹); this distinction is important

during his earthly life he was 'inevitably a light of the world whose brightness cannot be hidden'.¹ For such eye-witnesses of his majesty the Mount of Transfiguration was the scene of the whole gospel story in its Johannine form.

Here too Moses is a witness to the Messiah's glory in another sense. For it was he who 'lifted up the serpent in the wilderness', thereby foreshadowing the manner in which the Son of Man was to be lifted up (3¹⁴). Moreover, just as the people were cured by looking at the brazen serpent lifted up on the standard,² so every one who believes on the Son of Man³ through gazing at his glorious figure lifted up on the Cross⁴ will also be saved from the poisonous bite of 'the old serpent',⁵ and so have eternal life in him (the Son of Man). It seems that the evangelist here claims to be reporting our Lord's own words. It is to be noticed that the connexion of 'glory' with 'lifting up', although implicit only at 3¹⁴, becomes explicit in 12²³⁻⁴³.

² Peter, commenting on the Transfiguration, remarks that 'he received from God the Father honour and glory, when there came such a voice to him from the excellent glory, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased' (1¹⁷). This combination (*a*) of honour and glory and (*b*) of the beloved Son with an attribute of the Servant⁶ sums up much that is characteristic of the fourth gospel. This gospel teaches that the glory of the Father passes to his only Son (1¹⁴). The Son shares the Father's prerogatives; and the Father 'has given all judgement to the Son, that all may honour the Son as they honour the Father'. In fact their honour is one (5²¹⁻²³). The Son, therefore, does not, like his Jewish opponents, 'receive glory from men.' This sets a deep chasm between him and them. They cannot believe in him, because they are concerned with their own glory rather than with God's (5⁴¹⁻⁴⁷).⁷ The Son on the other hand does not seek his

¹ Bernard (p. 327) on 9⁵

² Num. 21⁹; cp. Wisd. 16⁶,⁷

³ *εἰς αὐτόν* is implied in 3¹⁵, whichever be the true reading

⁴ The meaning of the 'lifting up' in 3¹⁴, 8²⁸, 12³²,³⁴ is in any case not dependent upon the issues of a conflict of opinion such as occurred between Westcott supported by Abbott and Burkitt supported by Bernard. The question is decisively settled by the evangelist's own explicit statement in 12³³. See Bernard's notes on these passages (pp. 112-115, 303, 441-444)

⁵ Gen. 3¹⁻¹⁵, Rev. 12⁹

⁶ Isa. 42¹; cp. Mark 1¹¹, Matt. 17⁵

⁷ Moses is once more a witness to Christ (vv. 45-47)

own glory, but 'the glory of him that sent him' (7¹⁸; cp. 8⁵⁰). The Son honours the Father whose honour he shares (8⁴⁹; cf. 5²³), and is in turn glorified by the Father (8⁵⁴). The sickness of Lazarus was 'for the glory of God, that the Son of God might be glorified thereby' (11⁴),—that is, by the raising of Lazarus from the dead.

Here we pass to another aspect of Johannine teaching. St. Paul taught that Christ was raised from the dead 'through the glory of the Father'.¹ So at the tomb of Lazarus our Lord reminded Martha of his promise: 'If thou shalt believe, thou shalt see the glory of God.'² Evidently it is indicated that a fulfilment of this promise is to take place through the raising of Lazarus. That act of Christ is a 'sign' of God's glorious power present in the works of the Son. So the Son is glorified in the 'signs' of God's glory which he performs. The glory of God is not the sign itself, but the spiritual reality indicated by the sign. God is revealed in events, particularly in his 'marvellous works'.³ Thus there is in this gospel a promise that the glory of God shall be 'seen' by faith (cp. 1^{50, 51}); and the medium through which the glory is seen is to be sought in the works of Jesus. But the acts of Jesus reveal himself; the Son is glorified by the sign. For Jesus is the incarnate Word by whom the Father is exhibited (1^{14, 18}); this he does by his words and works.

The glory of God in the 'signs' is seen only by the eye of faith. There is no 'sign from heaven'.⁴ The Light of the world overcomes the darkness (12³¹), but not by compelling belief. Darkness may overtake men who turn from the light (12³⁵); yet the darkness did not overcome the light in the second creation any more than in the first (1⁵). There was a conflict between the two, which the evangelist records, especially in the first half of his gospel. The Light of the world sends the beams of his splendour into men's hearts, but cannot force an entrance against their will. The incarnate Word sows his word in men. He who hears the word, and believes him who sent the incarnate Word, has already eternal life (5²⁴); for 'the words which I have spoken to you are spirit and are life' (6⁶³). Sower and seed are one, as the sun and its rays are one. So there can be a mutual abiding of

¹ Rom. 6⁴

² 11⁴⁰; the connexion with the last reference is suggested by Bernard

³ see above, p. 240 and note 4

⁴ Mark 8¹⁸

word and believer; the revelation penetrates to the heart, and the heart dwells in its heavenly light, learning from it the truth which will set the believer free (8^{31, 32}).¹ But the glory of the Light may be shut out; the soil may be too hard to receive the seed. In that case the word becomes inoperative. Even if it gets below the surface, it does not continue its vital activity (8³⁷). On the other hand 'if any one keeps my word' (8⁵¹)² he will never die. For in him the word 'roots itself inwardly with power to save'.³ Thus in the fourth gospel as in the synoptists the process of initiation emerges from a divine sifting.⁴ The seed which is the word of God is rejected by some and received joyfully by others. Those who receive the word and 'in an honest and good heart hold it fast' bring forth the fruit of eternal life. We are reminded of the faith like 'a grain of mustard seed'. That too springs up in the heart through the ministry of the divine Sower. For the Sower is the incarnate Word; so the revelation of his glory creates faith and the vision which is the fruit of faith.

The eye-witnesses saw⁵ the glory of the only Son. The signs could only indicate that glory which is seen by the eye of faith.⁶ In 3¹⁴ the author shows where the glory is chiefly to be seen. He explains himself in 3¹⁶ and in 12²³⁻⁵⁰. The death upon the Cross was the decisive event in and through which our Lord was glorified (12²³).⁷ Without it there could be no gift of the Spirit or consequent enlightenment of the disciples (7³⁹, 16¹⁴).⁸ The seed sown must die if it is to bear fruit (12²⁴). Here Christ himself is the seed—a fitting Johannine application of the saying that 'the seed is the word of God' (Luke 8¹¹). The Word must fulfil his own sacrificial words;⁹ and to the man who follows him in the path of service he promises a share in the honour which the Father bestows on the Son. The next verse (27) is the Johannine parallel to the Agony in the Garden. The difference is instructive. Instead of 'Thy will be done' the Saviour prays: 'Father, glorify thy name.' Instead of the angel of the agony strengthening Christ to drink the cup of sacrifice (Luke 22^{42, 43}) there comes the Father's voice from heaven, saying: 'I glorified it and

¹ cp. 5³⁸² M: 'holds to what I say'³ Jas. 1²¹ (M)⁴ Matt. 3¹²⁵ 1¹⁴: ἐθεασάμεθα (sense vision)⁶ ὁψή, ὁψεσθε (1^{50, 51}, 11⁴⁰ et al.). See Bernard's notes (pp. 21, 67).⁷ cp. 13³¹, 17¹⁸ cp. 12¹⁶, 2²²⁹ John 12²⁴⁻²⁶ is parallel to Mark 8³⁴⁻³⁸

I will glorify it again'. The whole synoptic narrative is here translated into terms of God's glory. The Father glorified his name by sending his only Son into the world. He is now to glorify it again through the willing death of the Son. Similarly in 17^{4,5} the Son declares that he glorified the Father by completing the work given him to do in his earthly life, and then prays that the Father in turn will glorify the Son. The words which follow show the meaning of this prayer to be wholly selfless, as in verse 1. The Father is glorified by the glory of the Son, both in the Passion and in all that follows the Passion. Through the Passion the Son returned to the eternal glory 'in the bosom of the Father' (1¹⁸); and from the glory of his victory over death there flowed to mankind eternal life to the greater glory of God (17¹⁻⁵).¹

In 12³²⁻³⁴ the evangelist returns to the thesis of 3¹⁴ and 8²⁸. The Son of Man declares that he is to die by being lifted up on the Cross. Here however the brazen serpent is not mentioned. The context shows that another text is in view. In Isaiah 52¹³ the Greek Bible reads: 'Behold my servant . . . shall be lifted up and shall be greatly glorified.'² The uplifted Son of Man is here identified with the Servant of the Lord who was exalted and glorified *after* his sufferings.³ The serpent was uplifted on the standard, but in no sense glorified. The Son of Man was uplifted on the Cross and *glorified on the Cross*; and we can now see why the brazen serpent has such a prominent place in this gospel (at 3¹⁴) and yet is replaced by the Servant here. The serpent was to be gazed upon as a sign of God's glorious saving power. So also the Son of Man, uplifted on the Cross, is the visible embodiment of God's glorious power to save. But the serpent was an inanimate symbol. The Servant on the other hand is the living victim who willingly becomes a sacrifice for sin. Moreover the Servant is a spectacle to the nations. They are converted by beholding his sufferings. So not only is he glorified; but God is glorified in and through him.

Now the serpent was merely a passive instrument, by which God drew men back to bodily health. Indeed it was a likeness of

¹ cp. 13^{31,32}

² ὑψωθήσεται καὶ δοξασθήσεται σφόδρα. See further below, p. 252, note 3.

³ The quotation from Isa. 53¹, which follows in 12²⁸, confirms the identification

that which caused their sickness. God can make anything a symbol of his power to save, even if it be outwardly a symbol of destruction. The Servant, however, was not a passive instrument, but a willing agent of God's saving power; moreover the Servant was Israel, God's Son. Yet even so the Servant was 'disfigured till he seemed a man no more, deformed out of the semblance of a man'.¹ The peoples were converted by the Servant's sufferings and sacrifice; not because of his visible appearance, but in spite of it.² To that extent there was some analogy between the Servant and the serpent. Now thirdly, the Son of Man, like the Servant, was a willing agent of God's salvation. But he died a felon's death on the gallows amid the jeers and scoffs of unbelievers. The peoples were not drawn to God by the Servant's outward appearance, but by his vicarious sufferings. So mankind are drawn by Christ crucified to himself,³ not through the outward circumstances of his death, (to the Jews a stumbling-block and to the Greeks foolishness,) but by the willing sacrifice of himself for the sins of the world. As God can make a symbol of salvation out of a symbol of destruction, so he can make out of the scandal and folly of the Cross an emblem of his wisdom and glory and a means whereby all men are drawn into the arms of his beloved Son.⁴

The enigmatic comparison to the serpent (3¹⁴) is immediately followed by one of the major declarations of the evangelist, with further reflections closely parallel to the conclusion of chapter 12 (3¹⁶⁻²¹, 12³⁵⁻⁵⁰). To St. John the connexion is self-evident.⁵ The love of God for the world was so great that⁶ he gave his only-begotten Son. The Cross was the supreme revelation of God's love for the world. So in dying Jesus glorified his Father's name by making its glory manifest. For the glory of God is the majestic beauty of his nature which is love. But this glory is also the Son's, 'the glory such as the only Son receives from his Father'. It is, then, the glory of mutual love in the divine *koinonia*. Thus the divine *koinonia* of love was manifested when

¹ Isa. 52¹⁴ (M)² Isa. 52¹³⁻⁵³³ John 12³²

⁴ It is possible that this interpretation of the Cross through the blending of serpent and Servant had already been effected by St. Paul in Rom. 3²⁵. This would throw light on Gal. 3¹³ (cp. Gen. 3¹⁴) and on 2 Cor. 5²¹. See further below, pp. 445ff

⁵ γὰρ (3¹⁸)⁶ M: 'so dearly that'

the Father gave his all for the world's salvation, and when the Son freely gave himself to the Father in sacrifice for the world. To the believer God's love becomes completely accessible on the Cross; moreover the scandal and folly of the Cross, the identification of the Saviour with our sin, are essential both to our redemption and to the full unfolding of God's glorious love. But for this very reason 'our gospel . . . is veiled in them that are perishing'.¹ The Light of the world is hidden from those who 'loved the glory of men more than the glory of God' (12⁴³).² The unlovely figure of the brazen serpent is a perfect symbol of this veiling. So to the question of 'the multitude': 'How sayest thou, The Son of man must be lifted up?' there is no direct answer. Those who cannot see cannot be made to see. Jesus can only reply: 'While ye have the light, believe in the light, that ye may become sons of light' (12³⁴⁻³⁸). For the light which illuminates some may blind others. This, the evangelist declares, became clear to Isaiah 'because he saw his glory' (12³⁹⁻⁴¹). The evangelist here identifies himself with the eye-witnesses. Like Isaiah, he also 'saw his glory'; and therefore he wrote the gospel of the rejection.³

¹ 2 Cor. 4³

² In the immediate context this refers to those whose conviction did not pass into open confession; for it is only 'as she utters her confession' that the Church is cleansed and consecrated

³ Three further points may be noted concerning the relation of John 12 to Isa. 52¹³ ff: (i) The two key-words of Isa. 52¹³ (LXX) occur respectively in John 12²⁸ (δοξασθῆναι) and John 12³² (ἐψωθῶ), thus illuminating all that lies between those two verses. (ii) As in the prophecy the glorification is announced (52¹³) *before* the sufferings of the Servant are described, so in the gospel the coming glory of Jesus is announced in the three incidents which *inaugurate* the story of Holy Week (12¹⁻²³). Thus the *order* of prophecy is observed. (iii) On the other hand, the evangelist apparently understood the statement of Isa. 52¹³ as referring to all that follows in chapter 53. This provided Scriptural foundation for his doctrine of 'glory on the Cross'. Thus the *significance* of prophecy is manifested.

CHAPTER IX

THE RESURRECTION OF THE CHURCH

The relationship between Christ and the Church is expressed in a variety of ways in the New Testament. Moreover the conception of the Church is itself intimately bound up with the manner of our salvation through Christ, and also, for that very reason, with the actual significance of our Lord himself. The doctrine of the Church is inevitably embedded in biblical theology as a whole. This will become evident if we recall some of St. Paul's statements about the manner in which we partake of Christ. Two points are of cardinal importance: (1) the key-phrase: 'in Christ', and (2) the connexion of the Church with our Lord's resurrection. The key-phrase goes back to the beginnings of St. Paul's writings. For example it occurs about half a dozen times in 1 Thessalonians and has assumed immense importance in 1 Corinthians and in Galatians. In 1 Thessalonians the life of the new converts is summed up in the statement that 'ye turned unto God from idols, to serve a living and true God, and to wait for his Son from heaven, whom he raised from the dead, Jesus, who delivers us from the wrath to come' (1^{9,10}). They are 'in God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ' (1¹) and are therefore safe in the coming eschatological crisis. Moreover the Christians who have died are also safe. For they are 'in Christ' and shall rise with him (4¹⁶). To be 'in' the risen Christ is the whole of Christianity. We are already in him who has risen; yet our life consists in waiting for his manifested Presence (1¹⁰).

In 1 Corinthians the first mention of the metaphor from the body assumes it to be a truth familiar to the readers (6¹⁵). It is not developed in detail until a much later stage of the letter (12¹²⁻²⁷). Moreover in this first mention it is stated in the most realistic form: 'Know ye not that your bodies are members of Christ?' This is explained by the context¹ with its treatment of sexual immorality and its reference to the resurrection of the body. In this passage, also, there is a play upon the meaning of

¹ see above, Chapter I, pp. 15ff

the word 'body', which can be reproduced in English, as when we speak of 'somebody' or 'everybody'.¹ In Hebrew thought the body stands for the whole man and represents him. This is the basis of the Christian attitude to the body. But it received its full justification only in our Lord's resurrection. In that event all false spiritualism and dualism, so congenial to the Greek mind, and so devastating in its consequences, had already been put out of court. Morality is safeguarded by the biblical and Christian attitude to the body, and that in turn by the resurrection of our Lord. Not only is the body for the Lord, but the Lord for the body. Our bodies have a share in the consecrated life through membership in the risen Lord. The Lord is for the whole man; for he himself is whole man. God raised him up; for without the body he would not be whole man. God will raise us up through his power, that we may be whole men. For we are already wholly (in body and soul) members of the Christ, who in virtue of his risen life is the only completely whole man.

In this passage there is no explicit mention of the Church. Yet it contains in principle the whole doctrine of the Body (ch. 12) as well as the teaching of chapter 15 about the resurrection. It also contains a first draft of the doctrine of the bride of Christ (Eph. 5²¹⁻³³) which we considered in Chapter VIII. For in both passages the two forms of union suggested by the body and the bride cross one another. There the phrase: 'for we are members of his body' illustrates the 'one flesh' of bridegroom and bride (Eph. 5³⁰). Here, on the other hand, defilement of the body which is a member of Christ is treated as a form of spiritual adultery, that is, unfaithfulness to our union of spirit with the Lord (vv. 15-17). This is due to the fact that there is a unity of soul and body in one personality, just as there is a unity of man and woman in 'one flesh'. As man and woman have one common life, so soul and body have one common life. Each is a partnership which requires to be consecrated that it may become secure. The desecration of the former involves the desecration of the latter. The wholeness of human life is manifold, but essentially one. It can be consecrated, and therefore secured and completed, only in the One Man who is the only completely

¹ or in popular speech, simply of 'a body' meaning 'a person'; cp. Moffatt (M), *ad loc.*, pp. 69-73

whole Man. This is effected through our membership in the risen Lord in whom we look for the final redemption of our bodies (Rom. 8²³). This union with the Lord is a communion so intimate that we are one spirit with him, as a wife should be with her husband. But it is also a union so complete that we are one body with him, as limbs are parts of the body to which they belong. For the union of spirit corresponds to 'one flesh'.¹

In 1 Corinthians 12 the full picture of the Body of Christ is given. Here it is connected not with the consecration of the body, but with that unity of the common life which the Corinthians found so difficult to learn.² Spiritual gifts are given in the Church for mutual edification in a life where order is the fruit of charity. The gifts are distributed by the one Spirit in the community in accordance with the principle of many functions in one organism. The gifts are for the service of the Whole, not for the gratification of the individual parts. We are all united by the one Spirit in the common confession of 'Jesus as Lord'. He is the Messiah, to whom we all belong, as many members to one body; for

As the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of the body, being many, are one body; so also is the Christ.³

Now ye are the body of Christ, and severally members thereof.
(1 Cor. 12^{12, 27})

With these two verses the illustration begins and ends (vv. 12-27); and they summarize its essential teaching. Verse 12 tells us that 'the Christ' is like the human body. In him, the One, are we, the Many. Verse 27 tells us that we are 'the body of Christ.' So the Christ is 'the body'; and we are 'the body of Christ.' How are these two statements to be fitted together?

In the illustration the Church is not actually mentioned at all. The word *ecclesia* does not appear until verse 28, when the

¹ Note *ὁ κολλώμενος* (vv. 16, 17). The verb in its simple or compound form is used in LXX both for 'cleaving to the Lord' and for the cleaving of man to woman (in marriage or otherwise). See MM, p. 352², and cp. Gen. 2²⁴, 1 Kings 11², 2 Kings 18⁶, Eccus. 2³, 19²; see also Eph. 5³¹. The word might also suggest the 'joining' of a limb to a body (cp. v. 15), as its active form means 'to fasten'. The same double meaning seems to belong to its Hebrew equivalent; see BDB, pp. 179², 180¹

² cp. chs. 12-14 with chs. 1-3

³ or: 'so is it with the Christ'. RV omits 'the'

illustration is succeeded by a direct application. So the Body is described in two ways. As a 'whole' it is the Christ;¹ as an aggregate of 'parts' it is the members. But the Body is not thought of as a mere collection of individuals. For as soon as metaphor is dropped the Church appears in place of the aggregation of members. This suggests that in verse 27 the emphatic 'you' really means 'the Church'. The 'you' gives a personal application to the parable, driving home the importance of Christian unity at Corinth. It is as though a modern preacher were to say to his congregation: 'When the Bible speaks of the Church, it means you.' Nevertheless the illustration is not in three terms but in two. The Church is interpreted in terms of the Christ, the One Man who includes us all in himself. The fundamental thought of this passage is that there is one Christian organism; and that one organism is the Messiah. However, whereas the illustration is about 'the Messiah' (v. 12), the application is about 'the *ecclesia*' (v. 28). The two terms are important. For St. Paul they represent the two aspects of the New Israel. The Messiah and his community are inseparable. But the former is 'the whole' in which the latter is included. We are the Church because we are in the Christ. He gives unity to his members. The members are the Church because in him they are one; but not otherwise.

So 'the body is not one member, but many' (v. 14). The term *ecclesia* stands for the manifoldness of the organism; for the word properly means 'the congregation of Israel'. On the other hand the unity of the organism resides not in 'the congregation' as such, but in 'the Messiah' as God's anointed representative. For he is anointed with the Spirit. So entry into the one Body was 'by one Spirit', with whom all were imbued (v. 13).² The unity of the Church is in the One Man in whom all are included. In him, as the Messiah, the one purpose of God, recorded in the Scriptures of the old covenant, is fulfilled. Thereby the unity of the Scriptures is also vindicated, as the record of God's unfailing purpose. This explains the insistence upon the fulfilment of 'the Scripture' in the New Testament. It also explains the pains taken by St. Paul to expound the position and prerogatives of

¹ The article in v. 12 is important; the statement is about the Messiah (cp. 6¹⁵)

² see above, pp. 93 ff

our Lord as 'the Christ' in terms of the Old Testament. This follows a clearly marked course through the epistles. When the connexions are seen, one pattern emerges which also gathers up into a single picture the various aspects of the Body of Christ.

We continue, at present, to follow the teaching of 1 Corinthians about the One Man in whom we are all included. Chapter 6 told us that our bodies are members of the risen Lord; chapter 12 explained this doctrine of membership more fully. In chapter 15 we return to the One Man in whom we are members. The chapter was written in reply to some who denied the resurrection of the dead. 'How is it that some among you say that there is no resurrection of the dead?' 'The dead are not raised.' 'How are the dead raised?' 'With what sort of body do they come?'¹ Flat denials, or alternatively incredulous questions, have to be met.² The method of reply begins with a reminder of teaching already given. The questions raised are not to be settled by arguments about hypothetical possibilities. The faith of the Church on such matters depends in the first instance upon questions of fact. An appeal is made to the traditional account of the historic events, to the things which happened to the Christ in fulfilment of Scripture:

I delivered unto you first of all that which also I received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures; and that he was buried; and that he hath been raised on the third day according to the scriptures. (1 Cor. 15^{3,4})

There can be no serious doubt that the Scriptures twice referred to here include Isaiah 53. The third day corresponds to Jonah 1¹⁷ and Hosea 6^{2,3}. Otherwise the clearest anticipation of our Lord's passion, death and resurrection, taken together, is to be found in the picture of the Servant of the Lord. Now Isaiah 53 mentions 'the grave' of the Servant: 'they made his grave with the wicked, and with the rich in his death'. This must have seemed a perplexing sentence to the first Christians.⁴

¹ vv. 12, 16, 29, 32, 35

² The text of 1 Cor. 15 gives no support to Schweitzer's theory that the objectors are supporters of the earlier, prophetic, eschatology (cp. *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle*, ET, p. 93).

³ 'three days and three nights': 'on the third day he will raise us up.'

⁴ LXX in no way removes the obscurity; the Hebrew text appears to be corrupt

Our Lord was crucified between two felons and buried with honour in a rich man's grave. These facts did not correspond with Isaiah 53⁹. Accordingly the careful statement in 1 Corinthians 15 does not say that our Lord was buried in accordance with the Scriptures. All the more striking, then, is the insertion of the word which means 'he was entombed' into the statement between the other two phrases. The death for our sins and the resurrection on the third day were in accordance with the Scriptures. No such claim was made for 'the entombment'. Notwithstanding this, its insertion into the statement in its proper place between the other two messianic events shows clearly that it was considered to have vital importance in the tradition. It follows that this importance of the entombment was clearly recognized by St. Paul, when he handed over the statement to his converts. To say therefore that 'it is not the empty tomb that concerns Paul here'¹ is seriously to disregard the evidence. As will be shown, the 'tomb' concerned the author of this chapter so much that it dominates the whole of his argument.

The opening phrases which precede the statement of facts must also be noticed, both for their solemnity and for their precision. St. Paul declares that he is making known the good news which he announced to them originally, which they received from him when they first learnt the Christian tradition.² It is the good news 'in which you have your footing, the gospel by which you are saved—provided you adhere to my statement of it—unless indeed your faith was all haphazard'.³ Insistence upon right faith could scarcely be more emphatic. The gospel preached to them is the foundation under their feet and the means of their salvation,—but only on one condition. 'Through which you are saved,'—yes, provided that 'you adhere to my statement of it'; but apparently not otherwise. General assent was not enough. Not only the substance of the statement, but also its actual form, mattered immensely. So then, the mention of 'the tomb' was of the highest importance. On 'the tomb' and on what happened there, where 'the tomb' was, hung their salvation. If they abandoned the form of the statement their

¹ Moffatt (M), *ad loc.*, p. 237

² ὁ καὶ παρελάβετε (v. 1); cp. παρέδωκα ὑμῖν (v. 3)

³ 1 Cor. 15^{1, 2}; the last sentence is quoted from M

faith might prove to have been 'all haphazard'. Thus by his appeal to the tradition, with all that this appeal implied, the apostle has already cut the ground from under the feet of the objectors with whom he is about to deal.

Everything which follows in this chapter is determined already by the opening statement, by its insistence upon accepted facts and upon this particular way of stating those facts. The appearances to the witnesses must be interpreted in the light of the opening statement about the entombment and its sequel. Even the phrase 'has been raised'¹ (v. 4) looks back to the tomb, to which this abiding result must be related. There follows an emphatic declaration of agreement between the original witnesses of the event and the apostle 'born out of due time'.² He counts himself among the eye-witnesses, though he knows well that he did not deserve the honour. So 'whether it were I or they' we are agreed about the foundation facts, the facts which you accepted (vv. 8-11). This agreement is the more remarkable, inasmuch as the appearance of the risen Lord on the road to Damascus was not altogether comparable to those recorded in the Gospels. It suggests, perhaps, a special form of manifestation granted to one who received 'visions and revelations of the Lord', to such a man as was once 'caught up even to the third heaven'.³ The Church, however, was not founded upon mystical experiences. Here we see that the subject of those experiences fully recognized that fact. He registered his assent to it in this statement. As one who had 'seen'⁴ the Lord he taught his converts to rely on the evidence of the accredited witnesses to those historical facts which were the accepted basis of the Church's life. 'So we preach and so you believed.'⁵

¹ ἐγήγερται

² a very inadequate rendering of τῷ ἐκτρώματι, lit. 'the abortion' (v. 8), which may have been a nickname given by his judaizing opponents. If so, St. Paul rounds on them by glorying in the 'forced' and abnormal features of his new birth.

³ 2 Cor. 12^{1,2}. It was an 'appearance' of the *ascended* Lord; the word ὡφθη, however, aligns it with the other appearances in this list (vv. 5-8). See also below, p. 301.

⁴ ὅρακα (1 Cor. 9¹), on which see RP, *ad loc.* (p. 177); cp. also John 20¹⁸

⁵ Our Lord's tomb occupies an important place in the apostolic preaching in Acts. The Old Testament reference was found in Ps. 16. In Acts 2²⁴⁻²⁸ this psalm is quoted from LXX (Ps. 15), where the language of v. 10 is

In the argument which follows the statement about the entombment is presupposed. The objectors, with their Greek prejudices, could not accept 'a resurrection of the dead'. The stumbling-block lay in the body. They did not object to visions or assurances of survival. Every statement quoted from the objectors is about 'resurrection'; and the incredulous question: 'With what sort of body do they come?' (v. 35) shows that the whole dispute is about 'the body'. Moreover what is objected to is a rising of dead men from their graves. This is clear from verses 13-15: 'If there is no "resurrection of dead men", neither hath Christ been raised' (v. 13). The phrase looks back to the statement of verse 4: 'that he was placed in a tomb and that he hath been raised.'¹ If dead men do not rise the statement of verse 4 is false. In that case 'our preaching has gone for nothing, and your faith has gone for nothing too' (v. 14 M). But further we are then found to have borne false witness. The statement of the tradition which we passed on to you with such insistence about its exact form is then a tissue of lies. The statement about the tomb and the rising on the third day is not good news after all. It is simply untrue (v. 15). Moreover 'your faith is futile, you are still in your sins' (v. 17 M); and finally those who are fallen asleep in Christ have perished, so that mere hope in Christ is all that is left in this life, without foundation or fulfilment (vv. 18, 19).

In this gloomy conclusion it is to be observed that if Christ did not rise from the tomb, a double negative follows. Not only shall we not rise to any future life, but also 'you are still in your sins'. Here the Hebrew view of the body comes out clearly. The

understood to foretell that the Messiah's body will not corrupt in the grave (Acts 2²⁷). It was therefore a prediction of his bodily resurrection (v. 31). So too Acts 13²⁹ mentions our Lord's burial (*ἐθῆκαν εἰς μνημεῖον*). 'The tomb of David is mentioned there [Acts 2²⁹] to show that David was not raised from the dead' whereas 'the tomb of Jesus is mentioned here and in 1 Cor. 15⁴ *ἐτάφη* is put in, to show the reality of the death and thus the miraculousness of the resurrection' (LC in *Beginnings I*, vol. iv, p. 154: note on Acts 13²⁹).

¹ This last phrase (*ἐγγύερται*) is repeated from v. 4 no less than five times in vv. 12-20. The close connexion of this phrase with the tomb in v. 4 (see above, p. 259) is in this way repeatedly renewed in the reply to the objectors of v. 12; thus the whole force of the reply is made to depend upon he empty tomb.

body stands for the whole man.¹ If Christ's body was not raised, his life ended in defeat. If our bodies are not raised, we have no redemption. If physical death has the last word with the body, then sin has not been conquered. That is how the argument runs. But the argument can also be reversed, and stated the other way. This is actually done in Romans 8^{10, 11}. There it is recognized that the defeat of death lags behind the defeat of sin.² 'The body is dead, because of sin.' We cannot escape physical death as the penalty for sin. But 'the spirit is life because of righteousness'. Christ's triumph over sin has already begun in us. So we look forward to a resurrection of the body. But even so this hope has substance only because Christ has been raised.³

Both ways of stating the argument are closely connected with the teaching about the second Adam, which appears at this point in 1 Corinthians 15. The resurrection of Christ is the fact which vanquishes the objectors (vv. 12-19). He has been raised; we shall be raised. For he is a firstfruits of the harvest to follow. In this he is like Adam. For Adam sinned and died; and we share that death which is the penalty of his sin. Christ, however, died and was raised to life; and we in him shall share the life to which he has risen. The reference is to physical death in the present context; for it is answered by the resurrection of the dead (v. 21). This is borne out also by the future tense in the phrase: 'shall be made alive' (v. 22). But the physical and spiritual aspects cannot be sharply separated. Adam bequeathed death, a fitting symbol of our fallen state. 'In the Christ' the resurrection of the body will be the final defeat not only of death, but also of sin which brought in death. 'In the Messiah' (who fulfilled God's purpose recorded in Scripture) 'all shall be quickened' (v. 22). This statement indicates a prerogative which belongs to our Lord as the one who is anointed with the Spirit. The prerogative re-appears in verse 45 as a qualification of 'the last Adam'.

This final quickening will be 'in' the risen Lord, the One Man whose members we are. This is our assurance in the wait-

¹ see above, p. 254

² cp. 1 Cor. 15²⁶, where death is the last enemy to be abolished

³ see above, pp. 143 ff and 183 ff. Whichever way the argument is stated, our Lord's resurrection is presupposed as its foundation. For in him the triumph over both sin and death was simultaneous.

ing period. We are 'in' one who has already conquered death in his own person. The victory is therefore already secured for 'those who belong to the Messiah' (v. 23). The metaphor of the firstfruits suggests the certainty of the final harvest; but it also prepares the way for the illustration from seed-sowing which follows a little later (vv. 36-38). Moreover, both of these depend upon the form of the opening statement (v. 4). For when seed is sown there is biological continuity between what is sown and what springs up out of it. What is reaped has a real identity with what was sown, notwithstanding the fact that a complete transformation has taken place. So these metaphors imply that in the crucial instance of resurrection—that of our Lord himself—the physical organism was transformed. There was organic continuity between that which was laid in the tomb and that which was raised from the tomb, between that which was nailed to the Cross before a multitude of unbelieving witnesses and that which was seen in the Upper Room by a small company of believing witnesses. Identity was sustained through a profound transformation. Of the real character of that transformation the illustrations from nature can tell us nothing positive. They can but suggest possibilities of divine working beyond our present power of comprehension. Nevertheless these suggestions are trustworthy so far as they go, since they themselves are drawn from those workings of the divine power in creation which are accessible to our present powers of observation. Moreover these processes of creation are profoundly mysterious; yet our senses assure us that they are real. Thus reason is assisted to recognize the possibilities of yet higher mysteries of divine working, of which we can, with our present powers, form no clear conception. Reason is assisted; yet in this as in so many matters imagination is, and must remain, baffled.

So the objector in verse 36 is told to reflect upon his own knowledge of nature's workings. 'That which thou thyself sowest is not quickened, except it die.' But it *is* quickened. That is the whole point of the illustration. At this stage, however, we are told that 'the seed analogy, though picturesque, was not a perfect illustration of this change, for a seed does not die, strictly speaking; the plant is simply another form of the same seed'.¹ Two grounds are offered in criticism of the analogy:

¹ Moffatt (M), p. 261

(1) the seed 'does not die'; (2) the plant is, therefore, 'another form of the same seed.' The second complaint is really rather hard on St. Paul, as it shows how perfectly his illustration fits the facts, provided that the opening statement about the tomb (v. 4) be borne in mind. Dr. Moffatt's own translation has brought out the full force of that statement in the most admirable way. If the Corinthians 'adhere to my statement' they will recognize that the body raised on the third day was 'another form of the same' body which was laid in the tomb. Indeed the illustration strengthens the evidence for believing that this is precisely what the statement in verse 4 actually means.

But we are told that 'a seed does not die, strictly speaking'. Well, no doubt, it would be very astonishing if there was an exact point-to-point agreement between the two sides of the analogy. Such a complete agreement is not usually expected in any recognized use of the principle of analogy, as for example by St. Thomas Aquinas or by Bishop Butler. It is true, however, that the closer the analogy is, the more valuable it is for the purpose in hand. So the question might be asked: What do we mean by death? A Cartesian philosopher might answer: Death is a disruption of the connexion between two substances previously joined, namely soul and body. In the case of the seed sown it would certainly be difficult to say what these two substances were. For there is biological continuity throughout the process. Perhaps the ancient Greek dualism offered a similar difficulty to the mind of the objector whom St. Paul has in view in verse 36. He is, however, told to look at observable facts of nature before allowing his dualistic prejudices to settle the matter. For what happens to the seed? A process takes place, to which we might give two names: it is either 'decay' or 'transformation' according to what we have in mind. For it is not all decay. A vital 'something' is at the heart of that process which looks like decay. This vital principle is invisible. It eludes our senses. We can only watch its effects. By its effects we judge that the 'decay' of the seed is an organic process necessary to transformation from one form to an entirely different form.

It is the re-discovery of this very organic principle, everywhere at work in nature, which has done so much to destroy the old philosophic dualism, now recognized as an evil legacy

from Descartes.¹ Are we then to erect a dualistic view of death from a discredited philosophy² as an objection to St. Paul's argument? We may fairly suggest that the modern objector should listen to the advice offered by St. Paul to an ancient objector, who was invoking an older form of dualism against the doctrine of the resurrection. St. Paul's own presuppositions were not dualistic. For him, as Dr. Moffatt has pointed out, 'there was no sharp distinction between what we term soul and body.' Dr. Moffatt then quotes from another authority: 'The soul is more than the body, but the body is a perfectly valid manifestation of the soul; indeed the body is the soul in its outward form.' This would be St. Paul's view because he was 'one trained in Hebrew thought'.³ Now in the passage in 1 Corinthians 6, to which these comments of Dr. Moffatt refer, St. Paul speaking of 'food' and 'the stomach' writes: 'Yes, and God will do away with the one and the other' (v. 13 M). God will do away with the stomach; this is a repudiation of that view of the resurrection, which was also repudiated by our Lord in his reply to the Sadducean question.⁴ But St. Paul does not say that God will do away with the body. For 'the body is not an indifferent organ but the vital expression of the self'.⁵

Death then is an organic process, in which the bodily form of the human organism decays in order that its essential principle may pass into some new mode of expression. So far there is a good analogy in the corresponding decay of the seed. Moreover in the crucial instance: 'Christ the firstfruits', the analogy is as perfect as we could expect. For the miracle of his resurrection, notwithstanding its miraculous character, implies a transforming event in which there is continuity from the old to the new. According to the apostolic preaching, however, there was no corruption of the body (Acts 2³¹). Nothing corresponded to the decay of the seed. In our case the correspondence is exact in the matter of decay. The analogy seems to fail *here*, because of the time-interval between the dissolution of the physical frame laid in the grave and the resurrection of the body. This is the

¹ For details see my book, *The Incarnate Lord*, e.g. ch. ii

² see below, Additional Note B (p. 286)

³ Moffatt (M), p. 72; his quotation combines two sentences from J. Pedersen's *Israel, Its Life and Culture, I-II* (ET, Copenhagen, 1926), p. 171.

⁴ Mark 12^{24, 25}, Luke 20³⁴⁻³⁶

⁵ Moffatt (M), pp. 69, 70

point at which it may safely be said that in our case the analogy ought to fail. For death, as we know it, is both the symbol and the penalty of sin. This was a cardinal point of St. Paul's teaching. In the transformation of the seed spiritual hindrances do not enter in. With us they do, for 'the body is dead because of sin'. Notwithstanding these hindrances, which make the harvest so unlike the firstfruits, 'he that raised up Christ Jesus from the dead shall quicken also your mortal bodies through his Spirit that dwelleth in you' (Rom. 8^{10,11}).

The last quotation emphasizes strongly the continuity of 'the body' through, and in spite of, death; that too, in a passage in which the connexion between sin and death is prominent. The same emphatic doctrine of continuity is taught in Philippians 3²¹. There it is made clear that the transformation, so far from destroying continuity, is the means through which it is preserved. For Christ 'will transform the body that belongs to our low estate till it resembles the body of his Glory' (M). There is, however, another aspect of the analogy to which we must now pay attention. Returning to the text of 1 Corinthians 15 we read: 'That which thou sowest, thou sowest not the body that shall be, but a bare grain, it may chance of wheat, or of some other kind; but God giveth it a body even as it pleased him, and to each seed a body of its own' (vv. 37, 38). In the continuous biological process the 'seed' passes from one 'body' to another. The language of the text in Philippians makes this aspect of the analogy clear. What from one point of view is the same body transformed is from another point of view the same organism in a new form which may be called a new body. The one way of speaking emphasizes identity of essence notwithstanding change of form. The other way of speaking emphasizes difference of form notwithstanding identity of essence. So there is organic continuity from the 'body' which dies to the new 'body' which rises from the grave.

We cannot tell how this should be. But that is no reason for giving up either side of the truth revealed. The organism is the same; yet its old form is replaced by a new form. Death and dissolution divide the one body from the other. So we cannot overstress the differences between them, provided that we do not deny the identity through transformation to which nature offers so many analogies. The differences between the old body

and the new one are graphically enumerated in verses 42-44. The series of contrasted characteristics culminates in the words: 'it is sown an animate body, it is raised a spiritual body.' The last phrase, new and striking, is supported with the remark that the one body implies the other. The living body with which we are familiar corresponds to and represents the principle of created life. Now in man this life which we call 'the soul' means more than the power of living an animal existence. Its fundamental significance is spiritual. Its true destiny is one of response to the Holy Spirit of God. So, as St. Paul had already written elsewhere, human nature can be summed up in three words: 'the spirit and the soul and the body', all of which have a place in the full completeness of the consecrated life (1 Thess. 5²³).

The passage just quoted, the only one in the New Testament which gives this threefold enumeration, makes it clear (1) that the complete man includes these three aspects, and (2) that the integration of this threefold nature into one is a work of God. Only by his consecrating grace can we be brought to that state, where we are both whole and without blame in the presence of our Lord Jesus Christ. The concluding remark in 1 Corinthians 15⁴⁴ is an inference from the biblical teaching about man as illuminated by the resurrection of our Lord. In this same epistle (2¹¹⁻¹⁵) St. Paul teaches that man has a 'spirit' (v. 11). But he goes on to explain that only those are 'spiritual' who received the Spirit of God (vv. 12, 14).¹ Apart from the Holy Spirit man lives indeed, but not according to God's will, that is, not 'according to spirit' (Rom. 8^{4,5}). For God's will is done in the response of man's spirit to the Holy Spirit. In 1 Corinthians 2 the life which is merely 'animate', because unrenewed, is connected with, perhaps enslaved by, the spirit of the world (v. 12). Here, in chapter 15, however, the thought goes further. Those 'who belong to the Messiah'² (v. 23) will one day share with him that risen state to which he has already attained. When that takes place they will have a body which completely corresponds to the sanctified human 'spirit', just as our present body is the complete expression of the created life common to all men in our present mortal state.

This inference from the 'animate' body to the 'spiritual' body is next supported by a reference to the first creation.

¹ see above, pp. 109-112

² οἱ τοῦ χριστοῦ

So also it is written, The first man Adam became a living soul.¹ The last Adam became a life-giving spirit. (1 Cor. 15⁴⁵)

The second 'became' is not in the text of St. Paul. But it is required by the construction, and accurately conveys the sense of the second clause. Genesis has: 'man became a living soul.'² The first man Adam became a living soul when God 'formed man of the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life'. St. Paul does not explain when it was that 'the last Adam became a life-giving spirit'.³ The immediate point of this second clause is connected with the spiritual body. This is shown by the context (vv. 44, 46). Moreover the earlier statement (v. 22) that 'in the Messiah all shall be made alive' is now seen to refer primarily to the resurrection of the body. The future tense is in contrast to the present tense of 'in Adam all die.'⁴ We owe our 'animate' body to our descent from the first man. He became a 'living soul' in virtue of God's breath breathed into him. The divine breath entered a material form already prepared. The result was an 'animate body' corresponding to the animate being or living soul that the first man had now become. This is the life that we all share.

But 'the last Adam' is so called because he marks the close of the old order of Adam and the starting-point of a new order. He 'became a life-giving spirit'. He therefore was raised from the dead in a body corresponding perfectly to what he was, namely spirit. But he became not simply a spirit, but a life-giving spirit. He has the Creator's prerogative of originating life, not merely the creature's privilege of generating it.⁵ His

¹ 'An animate being' (M) preserves the connexion between *ψυχήν* (v. 45) and *ψυχικόν* (vv. 44, 46). On the other hand RV preserves the correspondence between *ζῶσαν* and *ζωοποιούν*.

² Gen. 2⁷

³ On this point see below, p. 433, n. 1

⁴ The agreement with Rom. 8^{10, 11} is again very complete, and the same verb is used: there *νεκρόν* (v. 10) and *θνητόν* (v. 11) belong to the present, *ζωοποιήσει* (v. 11) to the future as in 1 Cor. 15²²

⁵ The emphasis in *ζωοποιούν* is on the second half of the word. In Rom. 8¹¹ this word describes the Father's prerogative of raising the dead through the agency of the indwelling Spirit (whichever reading be adopted in the last line); cp. Rom. 4¹⁷. In 1 Cor. 15⁴⁵ the prerogative belongs to the incarnate Son; in 15²² he is the sphere in which it is to be exercised. In 2 Cor. 3⁶ it belongs to the Holy Spirit. So this attribute is assigned to the Holy Spirit in the words of the Nicaeno-Constantinopolitan Creed: *τὸ κύριον, τὸ ζωοποιόν*. Finally the word is used in St. John's Gospel to

prerogative as Creator has already been mentioned in this epistle (8⁶). In his Spirit-anointed humanity he is filled with the Holy Spirit, and in his risen life as the Head of the new creation he has the power of transmitting to us, his members, his own risen, glorified and Spirit-filled life. As the 'last Adam' the risen Lord has inaugurated a new race. For by communicating to us his risen life he can bring us to that wholeness of spirit, soul and body for which we were made, but which we can never attain for ourselves (1 Thess. 5²³). Thus we are being prepared for the spiritual body which will correspond perfectly to our redeemed state as members of Christ. At present, however, that harvesting is in the future.

'Each in his own order' (v. 23): the animate body comes first for us and is our present portion (v. 46). Belonging as we do to the race of 'the last Adam', we retain in this life the body which we derive from the first Adam. Now 'the first man is of the earth, earthy: the second man is of heaven' (v. 47). The reference again is to Genesis. 'Earthy' refers to 'the dust of the ground'.¹ Man was made out of soil taken from the earth. His body is therefore liable to decay and dissolution. This is our heritage as members of Adam's race. On the other hand, as members of the last Adam we are being prepared for a higher destiny. For he is 'the second man' who is 'from (out of) heaven'.² St. Paul believed firmly in our Lord's pre-existence.³ He would have endorsed the saying of John 3¹³, attributed by the evangelist to our Lord himself:⁴ 'The Son of man' is 'he that came down from (out of) heaven'. Indeed he may have known the saying. In any case the primary meaning of 1 Corinthians 15⁴⁷ must be the same. The thought of our Lord helping us from his present exalted state is not, however, to be excluded.⁵ At present we are

describe the prerogative of the Father and the Son (5²¹), and also of the Holy Spirit—following a reference to the Ascension (John 6^{62, 63}). See further below, pp. 275–278, 283, 284, 430–438, 442 ff

¹ Gen. 2⁷ (LXX: *χοῦν ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς*)

² The *ἀπό* of Genesis (see last note) is changed to *ἐκ*, the preposition of origin. This heightens the contrast between the earthly origin of the 'first man' and the heavenly origin of 'the second man' (cp. John 3^{13, 31}).

³ see 1 Cor. 8⁶, 2 Cor. 8⁹, Gal. 4⁴, Rom. 1³, 8³, Phil. 2^{5ff}, Col. 1^{15ff}

⁴ The discourse with Nicodemus apparently continues at least to the end of verse 15; see Bernard (ICC), p. 112

⁵ cp. Acts 7^{55–81} and the sequel in 9^{3–8}

stamped with the impress of our earthly origin. In the risen body we shall bear the likeness of him who came down from heaven (vv. 48, 49).¹

The two questions of verse 35 have now been answered. There remains one more problem, upon which St. Paul had already communicated a 'word of the Lord' to the Thessalonians (1 Thess. 4¹⁵⁻¹⁷). It concerns the relation of the Resurrection to the Second Advent. There the question was: What happens to those who die before the Advent? Here it is: What happens to those who survive to the Advent without death? The answer is: 'We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed' (v. 51). Death is not an indispensable preliminary to a share in that realm which the victorious Son will finally deliver up to God the Father (v. 24). But all must undergo the great transformation. For mortal man in his frailty and mortality is not able either to obtain or to possess that realm. It is God's realm and only he can give it.² Moreover it does not form part of his plan that corruption shall find an inheritance in that incorruptible world. So the dead shall rise in an incorruptible state; and we (who are still alive) shall be changed. For although mortal frailty and physical corruption can have no part in that world yet God can and will 'quicken our mortal bodies'.³ So this corruptible body which is mine will be changed, so as to be clothed with incorruption; and this mortal body which is mine will be finally released from the sway of death, and will become partaker in an immortal life. That is God's will, and therefore so it must be.⁴ When this change takes place death, 'the last enemy' (v. 26), will have been finally vanquished along with all our other foes. Such will be the victorious act of God 'through our Lord Jesus Christ' (vv. 50-57). It will be observed that in this last section, as at every other stage in the argument, the tomb of Christ (v. 4) dominates the argument. Having stated emphatically the impassable gulf which separates our present mortal conditions from those conditions which prevail in the risen life,

¹ cp. Rom. 8²⁹, Phil. 3²¹

² As in Matt. 16¹⁷ and Gal. 1¹⁶, the phrase: *σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα* (v. 50) marks a contrast between human weakness and divine power

³ Rom. 8¹¹ is here cited in interpretation of 1 Cor. 15⁵³; cp. above, p. 267, n. 4.

⁴ *δεῖ* (v. 53)

St. Paul then affirms the necessity that this identical organism, which now has the characteristics of corruptibility and mortality, shall hereafter by transformation exchange those characteristics for their opposites (v. 53). The first form of the body cannot pass over into the second form of the body. But the body which exists now in the first form will hereafter with unimpaired identity pass over into the second form. This must be so, for it is in accordance with God's revealed will. The revelation of this indispensable truth was given in the miracle of our Lord's resurrection from the tomb on the third day.

The Epistle to the Romans begins with a statement about the Gospel of God, 'which he promised beforehand through his prophets in the Holy Scriptures concerning his Son who became of the seed of David according to the flesh, who was declared to be¹ the Son of God with power, according to the Spirit of holiness, by (out of) a resurrection from the dead, (even) Jesus Christ our Lord' (1²⁻⁴). The meaning of this statement has been much disputed. But a good deal of misunderstanding is removed when three facts are noticed: (i) The statement has every appearance of being a primitive Christological confession, perhaps a formula of instruction. St. Paul may well be quoting a form of words already familiar to the Roman Christians, as a guarantee of his orthodoxy. This possibility is strengthened, if, as has been supposed, there is a literary or traditional connexion between this form of words and the angelic announcement in Luke 1³²⁻³⁵. Messianic prophecy, the seed of David, the Holy Spirit and the title 'Son of God' appear in both. (ii) The statement follows the form which is worked out more explicitly in Philippians 2⁵⁻¹¹. There the theme is pre-existence, humiliation, exaltation. So too here we have first the Son of God already existing, then the event by which he 'became'² Son of David, then the public proclamation of his title as Son after the resurrection. (iii) There is an obvious connexion of this statement with Psalm 2 and the tradition with which that psalm is associated. The psalm itself appears to be a poem about God's purpose as embodied in the messianic king. Its material is

¹ or 'designated' or 'installed as'

² With *γενομένου* here cp. a similar use of the word in Gal. 4⁴, Phil. 2⁷ and John 1¹⁴. In all of these passages the word marks the entry of the pre-existent Son into human nature.

drawn from the story of David, who conquered the hill of Zion and secured Israel from the threats of surrounding nations. Shortly afterwards David received the promise recorded in 2 Samuel 7⁸⁻¹⁷.

Soon after his establishment on Zion came this promise: 'I will set up thy seed after thee . . . and I will establish the throne of his kingdom for ever. I will be his father, and he shall be my son . . . my mercy shall not depart from him . . . thy throne shall be established for ever.'¹ The more important part of the promise was to take effect after David's death. It was the promise of an everlasting kingdom to the seed of David; and the king (of David's seed) would be God's son. In the psalm this promise is 'the decree' referred to (v. 7). Israel's national future is secure, because in accordance with the promise God has established 'his anointed' (v. 2) upon the hill of Zion (v. 6). Then the divine decree, as given through the mouth of Nathan, is proclaimed. The messianic king, like David, is set upon the holy hill. He himself rehearses the decree, a twofold promise: (a) 'Thou art my son; this day have I begotten thee'; (b) 'Ask of me, and I will give thee the nations for thine inheritance.' In the original promise David's son is declared to be God's son after David's conquest of Zion. In the psalm the messianic king is enthroned upon Zion, proclaimed as God's son and promised victory and universal inheritance.

Now our Lord was greeted as Son of David before his Passion.² He did not disown the title, but pointed out its paradoxical implications; for David's son is David's Lord.³ Nevertheless his messianic claim, the claim to be the Lord's anointed and therefore God's Son, was rejected by the official rulers of Israel,⁴ and by Jews and Gentiles.⁵ The insistence of the four gospels upon these public facts is remarkable both as to agreement and emphasis. The Church from the first recognised the importance of the Davidic Messiahship and found proof-texts to support its fulfilment in Jesus.⁶ One of these was Psalm 2.

¹ 2 Sam. 7¹²⁻¹⁶; Heb. 1⁵ combines this passage (v. 14) with Ps. 2⁷

² Mark 10^{47, 48}, 11¹⁰, Luke 18^{38, 39}, 19³⁸, Matt. 20^{30, 31}, 21^{9, 15}

³ Mark 12³⁵⁻³⁷, Matt. 21¹⁶

⁴ Mark 14⁶¹⁻⁶⁴, 15³², Luke 22⁶⁷⁻⁷¹, 23³⁵, Matt. 26⁶³⁻⁶⁸

⁵ Luke 23³⁶⁻³⁹, Matt. 27^{23, 28, 29, 39-44}, John 19^{2, 3, 12, 14, 15, 31}

⁶ Acts 2²⁵⁻²⁶, 4^{25, 26}

The question was then bound to be asked: How can the words: 'This day have I begotten thee' be applied to one who is recognized to have come down from heaven? More than one answer was possible.¹ The answer of Romans 1⁴ is apparently the solution most frequently adopted.² Jesus, who was Son of God before he entered this world, 'became of the seed of David' by his human birth. He is the true messianic king, in whom the promise to David has been fulfilled. But this truth was not accepted until after his resurrection. He came in lowliness and humiliation. He knew himself to be David's son and David's Lord. But the official rulers of his people could not recognize a king who came in the 'form of a slave'. The messianic secret was not made public until after the resurrection. Then the psalm was fulfilled. The resurrection was the victory of the messianic king over all his enemies. Then he took possession of the stronghold of Zion. Then the decree of his messianic sonship was rehearsed, first to the chosen witnesses of the resurrection; afterwards, at Pentecost and later, it was proclaimed to all the world.

All this is true; yet it is not the most important truth. It was not simply 'after' the resurrection that the sonship was proclaimed, but 'by' it and 'from'³ it. The declaration was 'with power, according to a (the) Spirit of holiness'. The resurrection was the foundation of all that followed. But further, it was the fountain-source from which flowed the stream of power whereby our Lord fulfils his messianic functions. At his baptism he was named the Beloved Son. For then began his mission which issued in his death. But the risen Lord exercises the fulness of the messianic functions. He was anointed with the Spirit of holiness at his baptism. He was conceived by the Holy Ghost at the beginning of his earthly existence. But by his resurrection he was enabled to exercise the functions⁴ of the last Adam, who not only partakes of the Spirit's anointing in its fulness, but also recreates fallen sinners, conforming them to the heavenly image

¹ cp. e.g. Luke 1³⁵, the reading of D *et al.* in Luke 3²², and Heb. 1⁵; of these the second connects Ps. 2⁷ with our Lord's baptism, and the third probably with his pre-existence.

² cp. Acts 13³³; Rom. 8²⁹ and Col. 1¹⁸ appear to have the same implication. See below, pp. 290, 291

³ *ἐξ*. The preposition may mean that the resurrection was the source of the declaration 'with power, according,' etc.

⁴ or perhaps: was manifested as possessing the functions

of his own sonship. That is the ground of his titles. He is 'Jesus Christ our Lord' (Rom. 1⁴), not only anointed with the Spirit of holiness himself, but also Lord of the Church, because out of his risen glory he pours that Spirit into the members of his Body.

In the pattern of St. Paul's Christology¹ the argument that Jesus is the true seed of Abraham in whom we are all included was worked out in Galatians.² The Epistle to the Romans starts with the declaration, just now considered, that our Lord became the seed of David. In the Old Testament promises were attached to both of these; and in Psalm 72 the promise to the messianic king is declared to include the promise to Abraham's seed.³ Now in Romans 4 the discussion of Abraham's faith concerning the birth of Isaac, his seed, issues in an identification of our Lord with 'Israel, my servant, . . . the seed of Abraham, my friend' (Isa. 41⁸).⁴ Thus on one side Jesus is the inclusive seed of Abraham in virtue of his being the messianic king of David's line, God's Son and his vice-regent over Israel. On the other side he is the inclusive seed in virtue of his being identified with Israel as the Servant of the Lord. It is clear from these facts that the doctrine of the Body of Christ might take two forms: (i) Jesus is the inclusive seed, who is Israel fulfilling the vocation of the Servant. On that side of Pauline Christology our Lord is inevitably 'the One Man'⁵ in whom we are included; and therefore Christ is the Body, as is clearly stated in 1 Corinthians 12¹². (ii) On the other hand Jesus is the seed of David who secures for Israel the promises made to Abraham. They are fulfilled in the Christ, as Psalm 72 asserts; we receive a share in them by his royal favour. Thus the Messiah stands over against the Church as her Lord; and she is his Bride, or alternatively the Body of which he is Head. Now we have seen that the bride metaphor is implicit in 1 Corinthians 6^{12ff}, as well as the body metaphor;⁶ also that the crossing of these two metaphors in Ephesians involves a double meaning of the word 'head'.⁷ We also found the beginning of this use of the word 'head', although with a less sharply defined meaning, in 1 Corinthians 11³.

¹ see above, pp. 256, 257

² see above, pp. 48-51

³ Ps. 72¹⁷; cp. above, p. 50, n. 2

⁴ above, pp. 52-56

⁵ The expression is used in this sense in Rom. 5¹⁵

⁶ see above, pp. 253-255 with n. 1 on p. 255

⁷ For this point and the next see above, pp. 221-223

It follows that as early as 1 Corinthians the ground is being prepared for the more developed doctrine of the Church as Body and Bride, corresponding to Christ the Head and Bridegroom, in Ephesians. Nevertheless even in Romans the doctrine that Jesus is the inclusive seed who is both Messiah and Israel has not yet developed into a form involving the explicit distinction between head and body. In Romans 5 the doctrine of 'the last Adam' is stated more fully than in 1 Corinthians, in a sense which implies that we are included in the One Man (the 'second man' of 1 Corinthians 15⁴⁷). This becomes explicit in the next chapter, where Christ is the holy tree into which we are grafted.¹ Here again, however, there are from the first two aspects of the metaphor and two possible lines of development. The race of Adam may be thought of simply as dying 'in Adam'. Then to our death 'in Adam' corresponds exactly the promise that 'in the Messiah all shall be made alive' (1 Cor. 15²²). It is this doctrine of inclusion which is also expressed in 2 Corinthians 5¹⁴. If 'in Adam all die' in the sense that we all belong to a race which is subject to death as the penalty for sin, then the corresponding language is fitting and reasonable. We all died to Adam in Christ's death. But if we are included in the death of the One Man we are also included in his risen life, as the next verse goes on to say (2 Cor. 5¹⁵). This is also the sequel of the Adam metaphor in Romans 6-8.

On the other hand it is equally true that the idea of the second Adam implied from the first the conception of Christ as the head of a new race. The doctrine that Christ is the Head of the Church is an obvious conclusion from 1 Corinthians 15⁴⁵⁻⁴⁹, the passage which was afterwards expanded into the argument of Romans 5¹²⁻⁸. The first step in this direction is taken in Romans, partly by the emphasis on the Davidic sonship in 1^{3,4}. But even more the advance along this line is due to the much fuller explanation of our dependence upon Christ for salvation from sin. Romans 5¹²⁻²¹ is typical of this whole development by its contrast of Adam and Christ as the inaugurators of two organic systems of consequences. It follows that Christ, the organism into which we are grafted (6³), is also the head of a new order which began in his person as the mediator of salvation; so that our salvation is secured 'in him'

¹ Rom. 6⁶; in place of branches broken off, as taught in 11¹⁷

because it was effected 'through him'. Thus, at whichever stage of its development we examine St. Paul's doctrine of the new organism which he calls the Body of Christ, the two aspects always appear as equally essential. We are in Christ as his members because of all that he is and all that he has done for us. The Church exists in virtue of the fact that the risen Christ is the Lord of the Church. To say that he is the Body in which we find unity and life is to say also that he is the Head of a new order of being to which we belong.

Now just as in 1 Corinthians the whole doctrine of the second Adam is based upon our Lord's resurrection, so also it is in Romans. Our Lord is head of the new race of Israel because he is the true messianic king of David's seed. The statement in Romans 1^{3,4} is another way of saying that our Lord became 'a life-giving spirit'. His messianic functions issued from the triumph of his resurrection. The decree of his messianic sonship took effect when he rose from the tomb with power. The life which issued from the resurrection was a life in accordance with the Spirit of holiness, a life both consecrated and consecrating. The new creation, which is signified by the term: 'last Adam', exists in the incarnate Lord. The Son of God became the anointed man upon whose human spirit rest all the gifts of the Holy Spirit in their fulness. If we are joined to him we become 'one spirit' (1 Cor. 6¹⁷). By being joined to him as members of the One Body we become partakers of his Spirit-anointed life. 'Christ in you' is 'the hope of glory' (Col. 1²⁷). As the sap flows from the holy tree into the grafted branch, the latter is transformed into the likeness of the tree's nature (Rom. 6⁵). We begin to bear in our spirits the image of God's Son, which we shall hereafter bear manifestly in our risen bodies.¹ But, as in 1 Corinthians 15, so also in Romans, all these results are based upon the Easter tomb.

As the theology of the resurrection in 1 Corinthians 15 is traced back to a precise statement of the facts, so also the theological argument of Romans 5-8 is prefaced by a statement about the facts to which that argument refers. This statement is contained in Romans 4¹⁶⁻²⁵. The reader is reminded of a previous discussion of this passage, in which it was pointed out that the birth of Isaac is regarded by St. Paul as a type of our

¹ Rom. 8^{23, 29}, 1 Cor. 15⁴⁹

Lord's resurrection.¹ In Hebrews 11 Moses is said to have shared the reproach of Christ by sharing the reproach of Israel under bondage in Egypt.² So here Abraham is in effect declared to have been justified, not simply for believing God's promise but for believing in the resurrection of Christ as typified prophetically in the birth of his own son, Isaac. This is shown by the language used in verses 17–22. Justifying faith is attributed to Abraham, the father of the faithful. In this light he stood 'before him whom he believed, even God, who quickeneth³ the dead, and calleth the things that are not, as though they were' (v. 17). Here God is described as the object of Abraham's faith in a quite specific manner, that is, as he who quickens the dead. The same word is used as in chapter 8¹¹, where the conviction that God will 'quicken also your mortal bodies' is grounded upon the fact that this same God is 'he that raised up Christ Jesus from the dead'. That is the association of ideas that the word bears in this epistle. We have already seen that this word describes in 1 Corinthians 15 (vv. 22, 45) the cardinal function of Christ as the last Adam. So its introduction at this point prepares the way for what follows.⁴

It is clear then that already in verse 17 the birth of Isaac is thought of in terms of a resurrection; and secondly, that this resurrection is essentially the act of the Creator, because to raise the dead is an act of creation. The final phrase makes this clear. He who quickens the dead is he who 'calleth the things that are not, as though they are'; that is to say, God summons into existence non-existent things, addressing his word to them as though they were already in existence.⁵ The Roman Christians might perhaps see the significance of the word used here.⁶ For they themselves had just been addressed as those who were called or summoned to be consecrated persons, by one who similarly had been summoned to be an apostle.⁷ So too our

¹ see above, pp. 52–53; cp. pp. 235, 236

² above, pp. 29, 30, 36

³ τοῦ ζῶσσοιοῦντος; see above, p. 267, n. 5

⁴ as its use in 2 Cor. 3⁶, of the Spirit in contrast to the Law, throws light upon the themes of 'new creation' and 'resurrection' developed in 2 Cor. 4 and 5; see Additional Note A on pp. 284–286 below.

⁵ cp. Judith 9⁶, where the things determined by God respond to his call, saying: 'Lo, we are here'

⁶ καλοῦντος

⁷ κλητοῖς ἁγίοις (17), κλητὸς ἀπόστολος (11)

Lord called or summoned his first disciples to follow him,¹ and told a parable of a king who summoned men to the wedding-feast of his son.² All of these might be regarded as typical acts of the new creation. In the Old Testament there are two passages in particular which are suggested by the last phrase of Romans 4¹⁷. The first, of course, is the opening section of Genesis, which doubtless St. Paul had in mind. There God is represented as uttering his creative word, and thereby summoning into existence light, order and life. He speaks to things as yet non-existent and they come at his bidding. Then he calls³ them in another sense. He calls them all by their names, giving them identity as well as existence. In the next chapter God creates the animals and the woman, but leaves it to Adam to give them their names. This headship of Adam over the first creation has its parallel in the headship of the second Adam over the new creation.

The second passage suggested by Romans 4¹⁷ is the parable of Israel's resurrection from the valley of dry bones (Ezek. 37¹⁻¹⁴). The prophet is told to prophesy over the bones and to address these words to them: 'O ye dry bones, hear the word of the Lord.' The ears of these bones were still non-existent. Yet God 'calleth the things that are not, as though they are'. When the resurrection of Israel has been thus symbolically effected, the application of the parable is made clear. Israel said: 'Our bones are dried up, and our hope is lost; we are clean cut off.' But God replies: 'Ye shall know that I am the Lord, when I have opened your graves, and caused you to come up out of your graves, O my people. And I will put my spirit in you, and ye shall live.'⁴ So too in the birth of Isaac God summoned the living out of the dead;—the dead body of Abraham and the dead womb of Sarah, these are 'the dead' whom God quickens (v. 17).⁵ Out of Sarah's womb, as out of a grave, God summoned the promised Seed to life. Abraham had taken note of the facts

¹ Mark 1²⁰, Matt. 4²¹ (following the invitation: δεῦτε, to two others)

² Matt. 22^{3, 4, 8}

³ ἐκάλεσεν (Gen. 1^{5, 8, 10} LXX); the author of Gen. 1¹⁻²⁴ left out the naming of the animals because that was already assigned to Adam in the other narrative (2^{19, 20, 23})

⁴ Ezek. 37^{4-6, 11-14}; in LXX for 'graves' we find μνήματα (v. 12) and τάφους (v. 13)

⁵ νεκρωμένον . . . νέκρωσιν (v. 19); cp. νεκρούς (v. 17)

and had not wavered in unbelief. For with God nothing is impossible.¹

Wherefore also it was reckoned unto him for righteousness. Now it was not written for his sake alone, that it was reckoned unto him; but for our sake also, unto whom it shall be reckoned, who believe on him that raised Jesus our Lord from the dead, who was delivered up for our trespasses, and was raised for our justification.² (Rom. 4²²⁻²⁵)

The argument about Abraham's faith in God concerning the birth of Isaac was stated so elaborately in terms of creation and resurrection in order that it might be applied to us. The context of this passage is 'justification by faith'. We are justified by a faith which conforms to the type of Abraham's faith. That is the main point. Now Abraham's faith was faith in a God who works miracles. Nothing is too hard for the Creator of heaven and earth (Gen. 18¹⁴). Abraham believed that God could bring dead bodies to life. His faith was both justified and justifying. God wrought the miracle and accounted his servant righteous. So with us, justifying faith is the faith of those 'who believe on him that raised Jesus our Lord from the dead' in accordance with Scripture. We are here back in that same cycle of ideas which we found in 1 Corinthians 15¹⁻⁴. As there, so here, it is the tomb that is important. There was nothing immaterial about the dead body of Abraham, or the tomb-like body of Sarah. So the meaning of our Lord's resurrection here is the same as we have found it to be in 1 Corinthians 15. We are given in a parable from the Old Testament a precise account of what resurrection from the dead means in order that there may be no mistake.

Once again our salvation depends, not only upon the substance of what is believed, but also upon the form in which it is believed. Unless our faith with regard to the resurrection of the Christ implies a miraculous work of God like that which is carefully stated in Romans 4¹⁷⁻²² our justification is in jeopardy. Moreover the miraculous work of God prefigured in Isaac is fulfilled in our Lord in accordance with

¹ vv. 19-21; cp. Gen. 18¹⁴. For the connexion of this text (Gen. 18¹⁴) and its context with Luke 1^{37, 38} see pp. 236-238 above.

² see above, pp. 53, n. 1, and 55, n. 1

the Servant prophecy (Rom. 4²⁵). Further, in that prophecy it was said:

Kings shall shut their mouths because of¹ him: for that which had not been told them shall they see; and that which they had not heard shall they understand.

Who hath believed that which we have heard?² And to whom hath the arm of the Lord been revealed? (Isa. 52¹⁵, 53¹)

For the marvellous works of God surpass all human expectations. That applies, however, not only to their spiritual effects, but also to their outward form.² Justifying faith is a gift of God. Otherwise we should never obtain it. Jesus was justified as the Servant for committing himself to the Father's power, and we are justified in him as we utter our confession of faith in respect of his death and resurrection.³

The parallel between this passage and the opening verses of 1 Corinthians 15 extends to one more phrase. The gospel 'wherein also ye stand, by which also ye are saved'⁴ is concerned with facts about 'Jesus Christ; through whom also we have had our access by faith into this grace wherein we stand'.⁵ 'This grace' is the sphere in which 'we have our standing' (M). We were conducted into that state of grace by Christ himself. We entered God's presence in the train of our great ambassador, who cleared the way for us by his conquest over death and the tomb. These facts, enumerated so precisely in 1 Corinthians 15^{3,4}, are there connected with fulfilment of the Scriptures. This fulfilment is more fully elaborated in Romans 4¹⁷⁻²⁵. The facts are the means of our salvation according to one epistle. We take our stand upon them and find firm ground. That firm ground is 'this grace' of justification according to the other epistle. So we are saved through the facts, because without them the bottom would fall out of the state of justification to which Christ brought us.

¹ RV margin; cp M

² see above, p. 240, n. 4, and cp. also pp. 249-252 with n. 4 on p. 251

³ cp. Rom. 10⁹⁻¹¹, Eph. 5²⁵⁻²⁷ (M), and above, pp. 227ff, 243f

⁴ 1 Cor. 15^{1,2} (RV)

⁵ Rom. 5^{1,2} (RV). This rendering of the two passages (inferior to M in both cases) preserves the close similarity of language, as represented in the

original: { ἐν ᾧ καὶ ἐστήκατε (1 Cor. 15¹) }
 { ἐν ᾧ ἐστήκαμεν (Rom. 5²) }

The initiation of the Church into the Passion of her Bridegroom (Eph. 5²⁵⁻²⁷)¹ had to be carried through to the end. The Church is cleansed and consecrated as she utters her confession of faith in respect of the whole eschatological crisis which she enters. This includes death, burial and resurrection. The initiation extends through Calvary to the other side of the Easter tomb. What is true of the individual is true also of the Church:

Or are ye ignorant that all we who were baptized into Christ Jesus were baptized into his death? We were buried therefore with him² through baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised from the dead through the glory of the Father, so we also might walk in newness of life. (Rom. 6^{3,4})

Once more we notice the emphasis upon the tomb. This passage interprets chapter 4¹⁷⁻²⁵ and corresponds to 1 Corinthians 15^{3,4}. But now we are told how the facts provide us with a foothold; it is because we have become identified with them and so with the Lord who passed through them. We were baptized into Christ's death. But burial affirms the completeness and reality of the death. So we were not only nailed to the Cross to share Christ's death, but also entombed with him to share his burial. 'We were buried with him through baptism into death.' As the waters closed over our heads we sank into the destroying flood which engulfed him.³ The immersion signifies death and burial in one act. But also, as Christ was raised from the dead through the power of the Father gloriously manifested (v. 4), so also we were raised with him from the tomb to a new life.

For by that same act of initiation completed we, the members, were joined to the Body of Christ. By grafting we became united with the likeness of his death. We were made limbs of that very organism which was crucified and laid in the tomb (v. 5).⁴ 'The crucified body of Christ made you dead to the Law, so that you might belong to another, to him who was raised from the dead' (Rom. 7⁴ M). We were united by grafting with the likeness of his death in order that through union with the Body which was crucified our 'sinful body' might be re-

¹ see Chapter VIII above

² *συνετάφημεν* = 'we were entombed with him'

³ cp. 1 Pet. 3¹⁸⁻²¹ and above, p. 196

⁴ see above, Chapter V, especially p. 148 with n. 2

duced to a state of impotence.¹ All this, however, took place because Christ is risen. We 'belong to . . . him who was raised from the dead'. We are members of the risen Christ. The Body to which we are joined *is* the risen Christ. In baptism we were made partakers in that greater initiation which took place when the first disciples passed from Good Friday to Easter Day. The Epistle to the Hebrews amplifies St. Paul's parable of Abraham and Isaac by adding another chapter. The trial of Abraham's faith was repeated when he was bidden to offer up his beloved and only son as a sacrifice. He stood the test, 'accounting that God is able to raise up, even from the dead; from whence he did also in a parable receive him back' (11¹⁷⁻¹⁹). So did the new Israel receive back Abraham's Seed from the dead, not in a figure, but in reality. 'We were hoping that it was he which should redeem Israel.'² But it had seemed that 'our hope is lost; we are clean cut off'.³ Yet 'ye shall know that I am the Lord, when I have opened your graves and caused you to come up out of your graves, O my people'.⁴ This came true most literally when Christ rose from the tomb. For he is Israel. As he himself had reminded them, 'It is written, I will smite the shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered abroad.'⁵ Apart from the Messiah his community is nothing; it melts away. He alone could bear the curse of the Law and be made sin for us. Their initiation could not avail apart from his, who is the perfecter as well as the author of faith. At the darkest hour Israel the Bride was represented by Israel the Bridegroom alone upon the Cross.

Yet that was sufficient. The curse was removed. 'The crucified body of Christ made you dead to the Law.' 'One died for all, therefore all died.' We are members of that Body which was crucified and is now raised. 'Apart from me ye can do nothing.'⁶ What happened to him happened in him to his community; and what happens to them is significant only if it happens in him. All that happened to him did also happen to them. This is the Johannine view of the initiation. It is made clear not only by the feet-washing, but also by the allegory of

¹ Rom. 6^{5, 6}; the 'sinful body' (6⁶) is the body which 'is dead because of sin' (8¹⁰).

² Luke 24²¹

³ Ezek. 37¹¹

⁴ Ezek. 37¹³

⁵ Mark 14²⁷, quoting Zech. 13⁷

⁶ John 15⁵

the Vine. For there, before the Passion has properly begun, they are already in him as branches of the Vine. The Vine is the genuine Israel, and they are parts of it, notwithstanding their imminent failure in the crisis. By this mystical identity they had their share in the passion and the death which were accomplished in his person. So also they were buried with him. The hope of Israel went down into the grave, and their hopes went too. For 'our hope is lost; we are clean cut off'. When the Messiah was in the tomb, Israel was in the tomb. For there is no Israel apart from the Messiah. So also finally, when he rose from the tomb, they rose from the baptismal waters of their initiation. When Christ rose, the Church rose from the dead.

There are certain major agreements running through the gospel narratives of the Resurrection. Notwithstanding the fragmentary character of the records, these agreements compel attention. In all the accounts, at the first stage, the tomb is discovered to be open and empty; and the tomb so found is the centre of attention to which all the witnesses are orientated. Secondly, the immediate reaction of the disciples to this mysterious fact is varied in its expression, but at a deeper level is essentially one in what it tells us. The first visitors to the tomb pass through amazement or perplexity, succeeded by fear and trembling.¹ Where one account ends, the other two synoptists indicate a further change after the angelic message.² The eleven are incredulous at first; but a visit to the tomb changes incredulity to wonder or even belief.³ Hearsay evidence carries no conviction, but leaves the hearers gloomy, disappointed and perplexed, or simply unbelieving.⁴ In one case a glance into the tomb produces misapprehension and fresh grief which nothing but the Lord's own voice can dispel.⁵ The total impression is that of an event which is unexpected and extraordinary. The emotional reactions are intense. But the event is not self-explanatory, and has only a negative effect upon those who are not directly confronted with it. Yet the evidence afforded by the tomb itself is not simply unintelligible; for in one case it creates belief.⁶ The evidence is consistent with a marvellous act

¹ Mark 16⁵, ⁸, Luke 24⁴, ⁵, Matt. 28⁵, ⁸

² Matt. 28⁸ (joy), Luke 24⁸ (memory)

³ Luke 24¹¹, ¹², John 20

⁴ Luke 24¹⁷⁻²⁴, John 20²⁴, ²⁵ (cp. Luke 24¹¹)

⁵ John 20¹¹⁻¹⁶

⁶ John 20⁸

of God, which entered the order of sense-experience, but which belonged also to the order of faith. For these reasons it was in itself stupendous, but perplexing, because as yet isolated from the total pattern of the disciples' experience and understanding.

In the second part of the story faith is not only re-created and re-established. It is also integrated with all the facts of the past, and related to the fulfilment of God's messianic purpose in the future. All this is effected by the self-manifestation of the risen Lord himself. Here the witnesses are, once more, all orientated in the same direction. But the direction has changed. Attention has now been turned away from the empty tomb to the Lord who rose from the tomb. For the Lord himself was the only adequate interpreter of the tomb. The Church was initiated *through* events, but not *by* events. Even the event of the Lord's appearance was not sufficient in itself to create faith apart from the direct personal communication of spirit to spirit.¹ Moreover here too the facts belong to two orders or two modes of being. Recognition occurs through the medium of personal intercourse. But this intercourse belongs to all levels of human relationship, spiritual, psychological and sensible. Its determining factor is the will of the Lord himself, acting upon memory and through laws of mental association, but also through channels of sense. There is nothing uniformly automatic about the process of recognition, nor about the means through which it is effected. For some it is swift, for others it is gradual; for some personal and intimate, for others it is brought about through a prolonged conversation culminating in a familiar action.²

So too the risen body is accessible to sense-experience, both as regards food and touch. Some are even invited to touch the sacred body. Yet here also there is no uniformity; for needs and attitudes of the soul vary. That which enters our present order of experience must not be assumed permanently to belong to it.³ All these facts are in accordance with the implications of St. Paul's phrase: 'spiritual body'. The risen body was completely at the command of the Lord's will, and perfectly adapted to the diverse needs and conditions under which he manifested himself to the faith of the disciples. 'The last Adam became a

¹ John 20^{15, 16}, Luke 24^{17ff}, 24³⁶⁻³⁸, Matt. 28¹⁷

² Matt. 28⁹, John 20¹⁴⁻¹⁷, Luke 24¹³⁻³²

³ John 20¹⁷; contrast 20¹⁷

life-giving spirit.' This implies no indifference to the sensible order. Rather is that order here wholly subordinated to the spiritual relations which it should always subserve and express.¹ This second phrase of St. Paul is most perfectly illustrated in St. John's picture of the risen Lord breathing upon his disciples, transmitting to them the Holy Spirit, with whom he himself was fully endowed, and committing to them the authority to execute the functions of his messianic mission.²

Additional Note A.

St. Paul on the resurrection of the body

Much has been written about the difference between 2 Cor. 5¹⁻¹⁰ and other passages in the Pauline epistles dealing with the same topic. There are however important connecting links. In the first place the opening clause refers back to the whole of the preceding section (4⁷⁻¹⁸). Our present earthly body is here regarded as a temporary habitation, a 'tent-house' (5¹), which is destined to be taken down and replaced by a more permanent building. For it is like an earthen vessel containing treasure (4⁷). It is 'the outward man' which is perishing in contrast to 'the inward man' which 'is being renewed day by day' (4¹⁶). What this means has already been explained in 4¹⁰⁻¹⁴; and the same theme recurs in yet another form in 5^{14ff} (cp. 5¹⁷ with 4⁶ and Gen. 1³). This mortal body is already the scene of that mysterious process by which it is identified even now with our Lord's death and resurrection. The sufferings of this present life are for St. Paul a sharing in the passion of Christ. 'The dying of Jesus' is being carried about in the apostle's body, in order that 'the life of Jesus may be manifested in' that same body which is 'our mortal flesh' (4^{10,11}). The phrase 'we who live are being delivered up unto death on account of Jesus' (παραδιδόμεθα, v. 11) should be compared with Rom. 4²⁵, 8³¹⁻³⁶. We share our Lord's vocation as the Servant (see pp. 52-56 with the notes and p. 229, n. 2). As the death of the Servant brought life to others, so was it in St. Paul's case (vv. 12, 15). Moreover the Christian interpretation of the Servant's triumph is to be found in our Lord's resurrection in which we shall all share (v. 14). So we are sustained by the inward fact of daily renewal in which the future resurrection is already anticipated (v. 16). The visible facts of bodily decay and temporal affliction cannot blind us to the invisible certainties of a glorious hereafter thus already substantiated (vv. 17, 18). Our present bodily frame is only a temporary dwelling. If it is dissolved 'we have a building from God, a house not made with hands, eternal, in the heavens' (5¹).

¹ see above, pp. 16, 17

² John 20²¹⁻²³

2 Cor. 5¹⁻⁴ expresses St. Paul's conviction that his bodily frame is wearing out and also his natural repugnance towards death. Vv. 2-4 express a desire 'to be clothed upon' with the heavenly dwelling without the dreaded disembodiment which must occur at death. This would be possible only if the *parousia* supervened before death. In that case the heavenly dwelling would be put over the earthly tent, like a labourer's frock slipped on over his other clothes, 'that the mortal part may be swallowed up by life' (v. 4; cp. 1 Cor. 15⁵⁴). The rare word *ἐπενδύσασθαι*, repeated twice (vv. 2, 4), may be illustrated by its noun *ἐπενδύτης*, on which see John 21⁷ and Bernard's note *ad loc.* (ICC, p. 697). Is St. John here introducing into his story a symbolical anticipation of St. Peter's death and resurrection? Cp. John 21^{18,19} with *τὸν ἐπενδύτην διεζώσατο, ἣν γὰρ γυμνός, καὶ . . .* in 21⁷, and both of these with 2 Cor. 5¹⁻⁴. See also below, pp. 314 ff

2 Cor. 5²⁻⁴ provides a valuable comment on the meaning of 1 Cor. 15⁵³ as applied to those who do not die before the *parousia*. The double metaphor of 'house' and 'clothing' is awkward; but the thought is not altogether different from that of the green coverings which clothe what was once a 'bare' seed (1 Cor. 15³⁶⁻³⁸). Moreover to 'God giveth it a body' (1 Cor. 15³⁸) there corresponds 'a process of building from God' in 2 Cor. 5¹. Both passages emphasize the contrast between the mortal body and the risen body; both emphasize the God-given character of the risen body and of the transformation. But in 2 Cor. 5¹ there is the further thought that, since we are risen with Christ, the risen body already exists, in some sense, as a heavenly reality which partakes in the character of eternity (*οἰκίαν αἰώνιον ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς*). If, however, it is 'himmlischen Leib' (KTW, i, 209¹⁰), it is still *οἰκοδομῆν*; it is in process of building (MM, p. 442¹). So finally both passages emphasize the continuity which connects the two forms. In 1 Cor. 15 this is effected by the analogy from nature. In 2 Cor. 5⁵ it is effected by reference to the *ἀρραβών* of the Spirit: 'I am prepared for this change by God, who has given me the Spirit as its pledge and instalment' (M). Here the God-given character of the transformation, so strongly emphasized in 1 Cor. 15⁵⁰⁻⁵⁷ (especially in vv. 50 and 57), is carried back to an earlier stage. As the hidden work of God goes on invisibly in the seed sown (1 Cor. 15^{37,38}), so also it goes on invisibly in the mortal body of a Christian before death in virtue of the *ἀρραβών* of the Spirit, itself another characteristic endowment of the Servant of which we partake (Isa. 61¹). Thus 2 Cor. 4¹⁰⁻⁵⁵ (cp. 1²²) already contains the elements of a great doctrine which was worked out more fully a little later (in Rom. 8, esp. vv. 9-30), the doctrine that the present work of the Spirit in us is already preparing us for our risen bodies (see above, pp. 181-187).

In 2 Cor. 5⁶⁻¹⁰ there is a change of mood. The dread of disembodiment at death (vv. 2-4) is replaced by the thought that in the disembodied state which intervenes before the resurrection we are

'present with the Lord', whereas here in our earthly pilgrimage in the body 'I have to lead my life in faith, without seeing him' (5⁷ M). A close parallel is provided by Phil. 1¹⁹⁻²⁶ (especially vv. 23, 24). So also Phil. 3^{10, 11} corresponds to 2 Cor. 4¹⁰⁻¹⁸, and Phil. 3²¹ to 1 Cor. 15⁵³ and Rom. 8¹¹. Finally, if the teaching of 2 Cor. 5¹⁻¹⁰ were in radical conflict with that of 1 Cor. 15 and were meant to supersede it, then the solemn protest of 2 Cor. 2¹⁷ would be a vain and empty boast.

Additional Note B.

'A discredited philosophy'

By the phrase 'a discredited philosophy' (p. 264 above) I mean something much wider than the system of Descartes. The positive value of that system lay in its clear distinction between spirit or mind and matter. The distinction, however, brought with it a *separation* which has carried the modern world away from the biblical view of man. (For a further theological illustration of this point see below, Additional Note F.)

The subject has been re-opened in A. A. Bowman's book, *A Sacramental Universe* (Oxford University Press, 1939). This was reviewed by Prof. A. E. Taylor under the title 'Back to Descartes' (*Philosophy*, vol. xvi, no. 62). After doing full justice to the merits of the book the reviewer expressed a grave doubt as to whether its general character was compatible with the theism which the author explicitly avowed (*op. cit.*, ch. 13). The cumulative force of Dr. Taylor's criticisms is really overwhelming, perhaps more so than the distinguished reviewer has seen fit to indicate. For Descartes theism was, in a certain sense, vital. In Bowman's *argument* it is not really operative. This fact seriously undercuts his own criticism of the anti-Cartesian movement in some of its recent manifestations. Moreover Bowman's exalted claims for the subjectivity of finite spirit are not balanced by any clear doctrine of divine revelation. In consequence the 'sacramental' character of the universe is never actually disclosed in the argument. On the other hand his attempted resuscitation of Descartes is only partial. Consider, for example, the following items: (1) 'If . . . it is the nature of reality to express itself in two or more mutually irreducible modes of being it may be that these modes exist in functional relation and constitute a system from the first. In this case *their union will be a primordial fact, coeval with the existence of the modes themselves*' (*op. cit.*, p. 179, italics mine). This refers to the union of soul and body; cp. in ch. 1, note 19: 'a relation much more fundamental.' (2) The admission on p. 250 that 'there is such a thing as the *natural history* of the spiritual' (the italics are Bowman's). (3) The sympathetic treatment of 'body-feelings' (pp. 157ff). (4) The very valuable account of 'body-mind' relations with which the book ends (chs. 15, 16).

All of these features are a long way removed from the Cartesian notion of a 'thinking' substance somewhat loosely attached to an 'extended' machine. On the other hand the 'neutral mosaic' of which Bowman complains in Holt (p. 152) is the dialectical obverse of that separation between the two Cartesian substances which the modern world has for three hundred years been desperately seeking to overcome. The true duality which alone can exorcise this dualism is not that adumbrated by Bowman, but rather the Christian duality of the relations between God and Man exhibited successively and yet cumulatively in Creation and Incarnation, in Death and Resurrection.

CHAPTER X

THE FULNESS OF CHRIST

St. Paul's teaching about the Body of Christ in Romans 12 is substantially the same as in 1 Corinthians 12. The illustration from the human body is introduced in Romans 12⁴, just as in 1 Corinthians 12¹², to emphasize the idea of a single organism in which the many parts contribute to the unity of the whole by fulfilling a variety of functions. The phrase in 1 Corinthians 12¹² identifying the Body with the Christ is not repeated. On the other hand instead of: 'ye are the body of Christ' we read: 'we, the many, are one body in Christ',¹ which has the same thought as 1 Corinthians 12^{14, 20}. Moreover, the addition of 'in Christ' shows that there is no change in the fundamental idea that we are the Body solely because we are in the One Man. In 1 Corinthians the teaching about the Body is closely connected with the function of the Holy Spirit in apportioning 'gifts'.² The same word is used in Romans (12⁶), but without the emphasis upon the Holy Spirit necessitated by the special problems of Corinth. There is one more point of both difference and connexion. Romans 12 begins with the exhortation to 'present your bodies a living sacrifice', in view of the plan of salvation which has been unfolded in the preceding argument. This doctrine of sacrifice is, however, integral to the main thought of the chapter as a whole.

For here, as in 1 Corinthians, the unity of the Body depends upon the subordination of the individual self to the larger whole. If the Corinthians needed to be rebuked for their egotism, as exhibited in party spirit and in their preference for ostentatious 'gifts', this danger also appears to be in St. Paul's mind in Romans 12. So there is a general reference to the dangers of self-importance and high-mindedness. Actually this warning connects the exhortation to sacrifice with the illustration of the body.³ Now the doctrine of sacrifice in Romans 12^{1, 2} corresponds to the statements about the sanctuary of God in the

¹ 1 Cor. 12²⁷, Rom. 12⁵

² *χαρίσματα* (12⁴⁻¹¹)

³ Rom. 12^{3, 4} (*γάρ-γάρ*); cp. also v. 16

letters to the Corinthians.¹ Moreover, as we have seen, in 1 Corinthians 6 the statement that 'your body is a temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you' follows closely upon the statement that 'your bodies are members of Christ'.² Thus the same connexions of thought run through Romans 12, as are to be found elsewhere in St. Paul's earlier letters. We have now to consider the corresponding teaching of the later epistles, Colossians and Ephesians, where important new developments appear.

The Epistle to the Colossians was written to combat a dangerous heresy. The Christians of Colossae were being told that Christ was only one of many heavenly beings. The 'heavenly bodies' (the planets, etc.) were supposed to embody angelic powers through whom the universe was ruled. These 'thrones and dominions, principalities and powers' must be worshipped and propitiated. All this was part of the current heathen theology, which was essentially polytheistic. It is probable however that at Colossae the whole system had a Jewish foundation. The angel hierarchies of late Judaism were identified with heavenly beings who controlled men's fate in this lower world. Salvation depended upon them; for the soul could not reach the highest heaven without passing through spheres which were ruled by these powers.³ St. Paul replied by declaring that if there be such heavenly powers they were all created by Christ, who was begotten before every creature (1¹⁵). They do not share with him the 'fulness' of deity. For in him the whole 'fulness' was pleased to dwell permanently (1¹⁹, 2⁹). Christians do not need to look to any other saviours than him. For he is not only the head of the Church (1¹⁸), but also the head of creation including every principality and power (2¹⁰). Moreover the so-called philosophy of the false teachers is a quack remedy. For the secret of God which has now been revealed is Christ himself, and in him are all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge hidden. To these treasures Christians have access and therefore need no other source of revelation. By comparison the false teachers would lead them back to 'the elements' (2²⁻⁸).⁴

¹ see Chapter I above, pp. 11-21

² 1 Cor. 6^{15, 19}; see above, pp. 15-19

³ See W. L. Knox, *St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles*, ch. 7, for a thoroughly competent account of the whole subject

⁴ The word στοιχεῖα (2⁸) meant both (i) the letters (ABC) and so

In the former of these two passages (1¹⁵⁻²⁰) our Lord is described twice as 'the firstborn'. As 'the firstborn' he is prior to and above every creature, because 'in him' the whole universe was created. He is the agent and goal of creation. He is before all things and all things are held together 'in him' (1¹⁵⁻¹⁷). In these verses he is called God's firstborn, as he is the author, ground and goal of the first creation. In verse 18, however, a transition is made to the second creation. Here our Lord is 'the head of the body, the church'. In that connexion he is a second time called 'firstborn', because he is 'the beginning, the firstborn from the dead'. For the interpretation of this double use of the term 'firstborn' we must go back to Romans 1^{3,4}, upon which further light is to be gained from Romans 8²⁹. In the last-mentioned text we are told that God fore-ordained his elect to be conformed to the image of his Son, 'that he might be the firstborn among many brethren'. Now St. Paul, giving substance to a contemporary current of thought about the Messiah, consistently taught our Lord's pre-existence.¹ But the Messiah was God's Son as heir to David's throne; our Lord, therefore, had a twofold sonship. He pre-existed as God's Son, and he was also declared to be Son in the messianic sense at his resurrection. This explains the twofold use of the title 'Son' in Romans 1^{3,4}. Romans 8²⁹ introduces the title 'firstborn' in reference to the messianic sonship which was proclaimed at the resurrection (Rom. 1⁴).²

Our Lord is 'the firstborn among many brethren' because he is the firstfruits of the resurrection. His messianic sonship became triumphantly manifest and finally operative when he rose from the dead. For only then had he fully conquered the powers of evil. In Psalm 2 Israel's enemies were as good as conquered already when David assumed the headship of Israel by his capture of Zion. Then immediately the decree of perpetual sonship and kingship was announced by God. That was the 'Davidic' situation which prefigured our Lord's triumph on the

'elementary knowledge' and (ii) the elements of the universe and so 'the elemental spirits' who controlled the world in the popular thought of that age. Cp. Gal. 4^{3, 9}, where the same punning and contemptuous reference to the 'elemental spirits' is made; the best interpretation of this passage seems again to be that of Knox (*op. cit.*, pp. 108, with nn. 2 and 4, and 109).

¹ see above, p. 268 and n. 3

² see above, pp. 270-273

first Easter Day as conceived by St. Paul in Romans 1⁴. But since we partake of our Lord's messianic character through union with him in his risen life it follows that we are 'all sons of God, through faith in Christ Jesus' (Gal. 3²⁶). He is therefore God's messianic 'firstborn among many brethren'. He calls us his brethren because we share his sonship in virtue of the resurrection. This explains the second use of the title 'firstborn' in Colossians 1. As 'firstborn from the dead' our Lord is head of the messianic community. He is therefore rightly called 'the head of the body, the church' (Col. 1¹⁸). For the same reason he is 'the beginning',¹ which means 'head of the new creation' and so second Adam. Thus Colossians 1¹⁵⁻²⁰ is building not only upon Galatians and Romans, but also upon 1 Corinthians 15. The pattern of St. Paul's Christology is one, although its articulation was subject to development.

The expression 'the beginning' also connects our Lord's headship of the new creation with his headship of the first creation. For it is the word used in Proverbs 8²²: 'The Lord possessed me as the beginning of his way.'² This expression and the language of Colossians 1¹⁵⁻¹⁷, assigning cosmic functions to our Lord, indicate that here St. Paul is identifying him as the pre-existent Messiah with Wisdom as described in Proverbs 8 and elsewhere in Jewish wisdom literature. The identification had already been made in 1 Corinthians.³ But here it is much more precise in its formulation. St. Paul is now deliberately framing a theology which will safeguard our Lord's position as the sole and adequate mediator between God and the universe. 'Firstborn' was a frequent title of Israel in the Old Testament; and in Psalm 89²⁷ it had been assigned also to the messianic king.⁴ In this connexion the expression really means that Israel is God's favourite son by contrast with all other peoples. The anointed king of David's line is therefore God's favourite son in a unique sense as the ruler of the chosen people. For primitive Christianity, however, the title also had the associations of the

¹ ἀρχή. On this subject cp. C. F. Burney in JTS, vol. xxvii, pp. 160ff. The article is summarized by A. E. J. Rawlinson in *The New Testament doctrine of the Christ*, pp. 163, 164.

² RV margin; in LXX ἀρχὴν ὁδῶν

³ Knox, *op. cit.*, ch. 5

⁴ strictly to David, but in reference to the promise in 2 Sam. 7¹⁴

'beloved' or 'only'¹ Son as set forth in the parable of the Vineyard and as authenticated by the Voice from heaven at the Baptism and at the Transfiguration (Mark 1¹¹, 9⁷).

Our Lord, then, was 'the beginning' of the new creation and firstborn from the dead. That defined his position as the inaugurator of a new order of life and as head of the Church. Now all of these titles belong to him in virtue of his victory over sin and death as the risen redeemer. But his mediatorial functions as redeemer are grounded upon what he is in himself, namely the Beloved Son who shares his Father's divine functions as creator of the universe. In Colossians 1¹³, 14 St. Paul had referred to our Lord as God's beloved Son² to whom we owe our redemption, the forgiveness of sins.³ In verse 15 he unfolds the full significance of this sonship in two phrases. It means first that Christ is 'the image of the invisible God'. In 2 Corinthians 4⁴ he had used the same phrase, explaining it further by saying that God, who at the first creation said: 'Light shall shine out of darkness', 'shined in our hearts to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ' (4⁶). It is for this reason that no other mediator is required. For 'in him', as the image of God, 'are all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge hidden' (Col. 2³). Moreover in the incarnate Son we have access to these treasures, so that they no longer remain hidden, except by our creaturely limitations. For elsewhere St. Paul declares that man is 'the image and glory of God', but that through sin we all 'fall short' of that glory.⁴ In short the 'image' was tarnished and blurred by the fall of the first Adam; but it is restored by the second Adam, because as God's only Son he possesses that image perfectly. Moreover by his resurrection he is able to restore it in us, because he is a 'life-giving spirit'. So as 'the firstborn from the dead' he became also 'the firstborn among many brethren' whom God 'fore-ordained to be conformed to the image of his Son'.⁵

But our Lord is not only 'the image of the invisible God'; he is also 'the firstborn of all creation'. A more exact rendering

¹ Both in Hebrew and in LXX Greek these two ideas are interchangeable

² for which 'Son of his love' is a Hebraism

³ The fundamental meaning of ἀφεσις is 'release' (MM, p. 96). So forgiveness included all aspects of redemption.

⁴ 1 Cor. 11⁷, Rom. 3²³

⁵ 1 Cor. 15⁴⁵, Col. 1¹⁸, Rom. 8²⁹

would be 'firstborn in relation to every creature'. Two truths are compressed into this phrase: (1) our Lord is the Son of God, to be contrasted with all created beings in virtue of his sonship; (2) he is 'before' every creature in all senses of 'before'. He existed prior to every creature in virtue of his sonship. For the same reason he is above and superior to every creature. It is clear that the status assigned to our Lord here is on the same level as that described in Hebrews 1¹⁻⁴ and throughout the fourth gospel. Similarly the functions of creator ascribed to him in verses 16, 17 are in no way inferior to those of the Logos in John 1¹⁻⁵. Moreover, when he is described as 'the beginning' in reference to the new creation in verse 18, this again is grounded upon the truth that he is 'the beginning' in relation to the first creation. He is identified with the Wisdom which was present at creation as God's companion, 'delight' and nursing (or master-workman).¹ The expression² in Proverbs 8²² was very naturally connected with Genesis 1¹. 'In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth.'³ Consequently St. Paul says that 'in him (as "the beginning") all things were created in the heavens and upon the earth' (1¹⁶). The Son is the beginning of God's way. All the divine activities *ad extra* flow from him as their source and as the sphere of their origination.⁴

It is important to notice that this line of thought is continued throughout the argument of Colossians by the simple repetition of the preposition 'in'.⁵ All things were created *in* Christ; so all things cohere *in* him. He is not only the source and sphere of creation, but also the permanent sphere of created existence.

¹ Prov. 8³⁰. The last-mentioned detail has been questioned, but is in any case taught in Wisd. 7³¹; cp. Toy (ICC), pp. 177, 178, on Prov. 8³⁰, and BDB, p. 54². On the other hand ἐκτίσέν με in Prov. 8²² (LXX) does not accurately represent the Hebrew. Whatever the passage may mean, it is clear that in Col. 1¹⁵⁻¹⁷ St. Paul does not accept the implications of that phrase in LXX. The Hebrew text of Prov. 8^{22,30} indicates the production of creative thought which is thus regarded as the darling child of the divine mind, God's beloved firstborn.

² יְהוָה = ἀρχήν; see further above, p. 291, n. 1

³ cp. also Ps. 104²⁴: 'in wisdom hast thou made them all'

⁴ The metaphysical implications of this teaching were afterwards more fully developed in terms of the Platonic doctrine of ideas; see my book, *The Incarnate Lord*, p. 228 and n. 1

⁵ 1^{16, 17, 18, 22, 24, 27, 28, 29, 3, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 20, 33, 15, 16, 18, 20, 47, 17}

The reason for this is given in 1¹⁹. *In* him all the fulness of the Godhead was pleased to dwell. The peculiar language of this verse is probably due to the fact that St. Paul is answering the false teachers in their own words. Their system was clearly similar to those of the later Gnostics, who divided 'the fulness' of deity amongst a number of semi-divine beings. In their own phraseology, says St. Paul, it was God's good pleasure that all the powers or attributes of deity should abide *in* the Beloved Son. This corresponds to the Johannine doctrine of the mutual indwelling of the Father and the Son.¹ For this reason, namely that our Lord possesses the fulness of deity,² he also became the mediator through whom the whole universe is reconciled to God. This was effected through his death upon the Cross. Moreover not only was reconciliation effected between God and creation, but also peace was made between the warring elements of creation itself. Such peace-making was the appropriate work of him *in* whom all things cohere. Without him the universe would fall to pieces. There would no longer be anything *common* between the parts. So his redeeming work restores the common life of all creation.

The redeemer's work has cosmic significance because in him the fulness of deity becomes available for the restoration of creation to its true relations with the Creator. We can see here a great doctrine of the Common Life unfolding itself. The life which the Beloved Son shares with the Father is the sphere in which creation exists. This is the Christian meaning of the line from a pagan poet which St. Paul quoted at Athens: 'In him we live and move and have our being.'³ All that is common to us flows from all that is common to the Persons of the Godhead. In so far as God's image is not effaced in us we share a common life which is drawn from God. But the Fall of man has introduced estrangement and enmity. For St. Paul and his contemporaries this human discord was certainly bound up with a wider cosmic discord whose source lay in a rebellion of angels.

¹ and to the later doctrine of the mutual 'coinherence' of the three Persons in the Trinity

² 'Fulness' in English has more than one meaning. The Greek phrase in Col. 1¹⁹, 2⁹ means, strictly, the sum total of the divine qualities.

³ Acts 17²⁸; cp. *Beginnings I*, vol. iv, pp. 217, 218; vol. v, note xx, esp. pp. 249-251

It was useless therefore to turn to angelic mediators; for they were involved in the catastrophe. The restoration of the common life of the universe could take place only through one who possessed all the resources of Godhead (1^{19,20}). The centre of this great work of reconciliation lies in the Body of Christ.

At this point St. Paul addresses the Colossian Christians directly: You too, along with the rest of creation, were in time past 'alienated and enemies in your mind in your evil works'. But now, by his act upon the Cross, Christ reconciled you 'in the body of his flesh through death'. The reference here is to our Lord's 'mortal body'.¹ In that physical frame he was nailed to the Cross. The death of his mortal body was therefore the means through which we were reconciled. But that is not all. The mortal body nailed to the Cross was the site of the great act of reconciliation, the sphere *in* which it took place. There is a precise correspondence here between the two creations. In the Beloved Son resides the fulness of deity. In virtue of that fact both creations took place in him; but each according to its proper mode. The first creation took place in him as its divine ground, *ex nihilo* as later theology said. There was no finite *locus* or material employed. The second creation, however, was a restoration of the first. Its *locus* or site was therefore the human body which the redeemer took to himself out of the first creation to be the new organism of restored creation. This identification between 'the body' and 'the organism' of the new creation presupposes the Jewish-Christian conception of the body as 'a perfectly valid manifestation of the soul'.² The body nailed to the Cross was, therefore, in this sense the new organism of the One Man in whom we all died (2 Cor. 5¹⁴).

The first word in the Hebrew Bible is the single phrase which in its English form becomes: 'In the beginning'. Now it follows from St. Paul's identification of our Lord with 'the beginning' that in this epistle, at least, the phrase 'in Christ' becomes the equivalent of 'in the beginning'. This may help us to understand the meaning of our Lord's title: 'the head of the body' (Col. 1¹⁸) which appears here for the first time in the Pauline writings. In earlier epistles St. Paul had likened our Lord to Adam, because he thought of Adam both as the first member of the human race and also as the representative of the race as a whole. The race

¹ M, *ad loc.*

² see above, p. 264

can be called Adam, because certain consequences flow from Adam to all who belong to the race. His transgression involved our death; therefore all die in him. He was a microcosm of the race, because all that happened in him happens in us. In any series where one member is such a microcosm of the whole, that member could be called the head in a peculiar sense. For he is not merely the first instance of the series or the starting-point of what follows. He is the source which contains all that is derived from it, as a fountain or spring may be said to contain all the water which flows from it. In this sense also our Lord is 'the beginning' and 'the head'. The metaphor of the head by itself might suggest simply the most important and representative member of the organism, as for example the emperor was 'head' of the Roman Empire.¹ The Messiah too was head of the messianic community. But St. Paul had identified Jesus as Messiah with the divine Wisdom, the ground and source of creation. For him therefore our Lord was 'the beginning' of God's ways in both creations, in the sense that both creations were included in him and summed up in him.²

For this reason 'the head' means 'the goal' as well as the beginning. So 'all things were created' not only through him but also 'unto him' (1¹⁶). This aspect of our Lord's headship was correctly interpreted in the Epistle to the Ephesians in its doctrine that God planned to sum up all things in Christ. Here 'the head' is the sum of the whole series in which all are represented and included, as the Greek word indicates.³ It follows that the Head of the Church is (in current language) the Alpha and the Omega, the beginning and the end of both creations. This is properly a title of 'the Lord God, who is and who was and who is coming, the almighty' (Rev. 1⁸).⁴ But the author who so uses this title goes on, at the end of his book, to apply the same language to our Lord: 'I am the Alpha and the Omega, the first and the last, the beginning and the end' (22¹³).⁵ In the earlier passage the risen Christ claims this title for himself in close connexion with the fact of his resurrection: 'I am the

¹ For contemporary use of this language see Knox, *op. cit.*, pp. 160-162

² For the *new* creation this is already implicit in the conception of the One Man

³ ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι (Eph. 1¹⁰)

⁴ cp. Isa. 41⁴, 44⁶, 48¹²

⁵ The speaker is identified in v. 16

first and the last and the living one,—I was dead and behold I am alive for evermore' (1^{17,18}). So too in Colossians the sequence of titles in the new creation is: 'the head of the body, the church; who is the beginning, the firstborn from the dead' (1¹⁸).

When our Lord rose from the dead he was not simply the first to rise. For he then became a fountain-source of new life. He *is* the resurrection¹ for all his people. They are risen in him, and will be raised hereafter in their bodies because they are members of the risen Lord. That is the connexion between the firstfruits and the harvest in 1 Corinthians and Romans. No new doctrine is stated in Colossians. But there is now made explicit what all along had been implicit, namely the title of headship. The risen Lord is therefore pre-eminent in all things and over all beings in creation (1¹⁸). The whole significance of creation now lies in the new creation which is summed up in the Christ. His pre-eminence in the Church carries with it his pre-eminence over all created beings, whose restoration can come only through the Church. The gospel preached in the Church is therefore said to have been 'preached in all creation under heaven' (1²³). This is repeated in Ephesians (3⁸⁻¹⁰). It is there correctly interpreted to mean that the Gospel of Christ is proclaimed to the angelic hierarchies, because they too are involved in the subjection of creation to vanity.² So Christ is 'the head of every principality and power' (2¹⁰). He was that, as their Creator; but the triumph of the resurrection makes it manifest.

This headship over both creations rests upon our Lord's possession of the entire fulness of the Godhead. This expression, introduced in reply to the Colossian heresy, has a special application in the sphere of the new creation. This is stated in the following words:

For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily, and in him ye are made full. (Col. 2^{9,10})

There are two statements here about the fulness of Christ. The first clause connects previous statements about 'the fulness' with our Lord's present state. He in whom all the fulness dwells (1¹⁹) reconciled us 'in the body of his flesh through death' (1²²). His possession of the fulness lies behind the efficacy

¹ cp. John 11²⁵

² Rom. 8¹⁹⁻²¹

of his reconciling action; and this action was effected 'in the body of his flesh'. When Christ died upon the Cross, his voluntary death in a mortal body had in it all the riches of the Godhead, all the fulness of deity. It is by this very fact that we are made rich.¹ Now, in his risen and glorified state, he is still in the body. For the mortal body was raised from the tomb and became the risen body. So in him all the fulness of the Godhead dwells in a bodily manner² (2⁹). This does not, of course, mean that the fulness of the Godhead is confined spatially in a body. In fact the term 'bodywise' may have been used expressly to exclude such a materialistic notion.

St. Paul finds in the risen body of Christ the connexion between the Church and the fulness of the Godhead. The word which is rendered 'bodily' must refer to our Lord's risen body. For the whole statement is about Christ as he now is, in his risen state of glory. The statement contains two parts, in each of which the phrase 'in him' occurs. The word 'bodily' is the indispensable link between these two parts. 'In him' is the fulness of the Godhead; 'in him' ye are made full. In the risen Lord ye are made full, because in the risen Lord is the fulness of deity. The two statements hang together because the risen body of the Lord is the *locus* both of the fulness of deity and of the Christians who are made full. This is in accordance with St. Paul's consistent teaching. He told the Corinthians that their bodies were members of the risen Lord, and that the Lord is the Body of which we are members.³ There is only one Body of Christ. But it has different aspects. We are members of that body which was nailed to the Cross, laid in the tomb and raised to life on the third day. There is only one organism of the new creation; and we are members of that one organism which is Christ. In the earlier epistles there is no attempt made to differentiate between the various aspects of the one organism. The Body of which we are members is identified with the One Man in whom we are included. For the body is 'a perfectly valid manifestation of the soul' and therefore 'body' and 'man' may be interchangeable terms.

This position is not given up in Colossians and Ephesians. On the contrary it receives new justification in the doctrine that

¹ 2 Cor. 8⁹

² σωματικῶς

³ 1 Cor. 6¹⁵, 12¹²; see above, Chapter IX, pp. 253-256

Christ as the Wisdom of God is the ground and sphere of creation. If all things are in him because he is identified with the Wisdom of God, then clearly all Christians are in him because he is the firstborn from the dead. As he is the 'head' or 'beginning' in which all things cohere, so in his incarnate state he is 'the place' in which all the discords of creation are reconciled.¹ But if the body is thought of as representing the whole man, then the crucified body of Christ was the place or *locus* of our reconciliation to God; and the risen body of Christ is the place or sphere in which we now exist, and in which we are filled 'unto all the fulness of God'.²

This doctrine of identity between the various aspects of Christ's Body is, however, developed in the later epistles into a doctrine of 'identity in distinction'. The way had already been prepared for this in 1 Corinthians 15 by the argument there unfolded concerning the relation of the risen body to the mortal body. We found the relation to consist in the fact that there is identity of essence, but difference of form. It was also noted that the continuity between the mortal body and the risen body could be differently stated according as the emphasis was placed either upon the identity of essence or upon the difference of form.³ This doctrine of identity in distinction must be applied to the new organism in all its aspects. In Colossians the distinction between the Head and the Body introduces a new application of the same principle. The distinction, first mentioned in 1¹⁸, is developed further in 2¹⁹. There the head is the source of life to the whole body, the centre from which it is supplied through the joints and bands, so as to 'increase with the increase of God'. In this epistle Christ is described as the head of creation (2¹⁰) as well as of the Church. The 'body' re-

¹ In Gen. 28¹¹ it is said that 'Jacob lighted upon the place' (so the Hebrew). But the verb also means 'to meet' (a person)—cp. Gen. 32²—and is so rendered in LXX: 'met a place.' This suggested the term 'the Place' as a name of God to rabbinical Judaism (W. L. Knox, *op. cit.*, p. 164; cp. also C. H. Dodd, *The Bible and the Greeks*, pp. 20, 21). God fills the world and therefore he is 'the Place' in which all things are contained. But Wisdom fills the world (Wisd. 1⁷, 8¹); so Christ as Wisdom is the sphere of creation (Col. 1^{16, 17}). Accordingly the incarnate Lord is the place, sphere or *locus*, wherein the whole of creation is reconciled to God. The same conclusion follows from regarding him as 'the beginning' of Gen. 1¹ and Prov. 8²².

² Eph. 3¹⁹; cp. Col. 2¹⁰

³ see above, p. 265

ferred to in 2¹⁹ might therefore be the universe of created beings, men and angels. On the other hand in 1¹⁸ where the title 'head' is first introduced it is expressly related to 'the body, the church'. Again in 1²⁴ reference is made to 'his body which is the church'. On the other hand when Christ is called head of the angels in 2¹⁰ no mention is made of 'the body'. These facts are decisive. In this epistle 'the body' in relation to 'the head' always means the Church. The reference to headship over creation is introduced only to show the all-sufficiency of Christ as the sphere in which we are filled (2^{9,10}; cp. also 3¹⁵).

This biological metaphor differentiates the Church from Christ. There is still only one organism, however, and the older language about being 'in Christ' continues in full force (1²⁸, 2^{6,7,9}). But in the one organism Christ has the pre-eminence (1¹⁸). He is the source of the new life which we enjoy in the Church. The *ecclesia* is now given a relative identity of its own, which is to be more fully developed in Ephesians under the biblical image of the bride.¹ In Colossians, however, the Church has no independent life. Without the Head it has no significance, nor even existence. There is, moreover, a further distinction in the new use of terms. The Church, as the Body of Christ, is now distinguished, not only from him as the Head, but also from the mortal body of flesh and blood which was nailed to the Cross. This is clear from the precise language used in 1^{22,24}. The first of these verses refers to Christ's reconciling act 'in the body of his flesh' through death. In verse 24, however, St. Paul refers to his own sufferings 'in my flesh on behalf of his body, the church'. Thus a contrast is made between 'his flesh' and 'my flesh'.

Moreover there is an unmistakeable contrast between the mortal or fleshly body of Christ and another body which is also his but which is identified with the Church. It is customary to refer to the Church as 'the mystical body' of Christ with this distinction in view. It is 'mystical' in contrast to his natural body of flesh and blood. So much is clear. Our relations with our Lord belong to an order of 'mystical' communion which is mediated through the Church, in contrast to the 'sensible' communion which the disciples had with him in his earthly

¹ The germ is already contained in 1 Cor. 6¹⁷; but there the 'bride' is the Christian soul. See above, Chapter IX, pp. 254, 255; cp. pp. 18, 19.

life. Their sensible communion was mediated through his natural body. But here a further distinction has to be made. The natural body was mortal and suffered death. It was laid in the tomb and was raised on the third day. Though transformed its identity was maintained under a change of form. In the last chapter it was argued that this was St. Paul's belief. Again, according to the evidence of the gospels, the Lord made himself known to the disciples in the risen body through the channels of sense-experience. On the other hand the appearance to St. Paul may have corresponded more closely to the visions granted to mystics. If this were so, then, the risen body could be a channel of communication either in the sensible or in the mystical order.

These considerations may suggest that the risen body holds a mediating position between the mortal body and the mystical body. The situation, as presented in the gospel narratives, may have the same implication. For the risen Lord's appearances hold an intermediate position between the story of his earthly life and the story of the apostolic Church as set forth in Acts and indicated in the epistles. To this must be added the fact that throughout the Pauline epistles to be 'in Christ' means to be in the risen Lord. Moreover, not only is the Church in Christ; he also is in the Church both corporately and individually. For his Spirit dwells in the Church as in a shrine, and also in each of the members, conveying Christ's life to all. This has been sufficiently illustrated in previous chapters.¹ But if the risen Lord is in his mystical body, how is that fact to be related to the body in which he appeared to his disciples after his resurrection?

Let us, at this point, recall the two striking phrases in 1 Corinthians 15: (1) the risen body is 'spiritual' and (2) the risen Lord is a 'life-giving spirit'. The risen body corresponds perfectly to the needs and capacities of the completely sanctified spirit. What we must wait for until we have been made ready for it, was his by right from the moment that his victory was completed. But further, in his case the spiritual body corresponds perfectly not only to the stainless integrity of his human nature, but also to his messianic vocation and endowments. It corresponds to his anointing with the fulness of the Holy Spirit and

¹ cp. also Col. 1²⁷ and the implications of 2¹⁹

again to his privilege of bestowing that fulness upon mankind in the Church. Here we must take into account the second phrase. For our Lord is not simply spirit, but 'a life-giving spirit'. His spiritual body must correspond not only to the splendour of a completely triumphant and stainless human life, perfect in its personal integrity and fulness. It must correspond also to his capacity for bestowing new life in the new order. That capacity is connected with his messianic mission and is grounded in his eternal being. Grounded as it is in his person as the Beloved Son and in his functions as creator, it is in scope as wide as the human race and has ultimately cosmic significance. In his incarnate state our Lord is the One Man in whom we are included. He is to be identified with the new order to which we belong. The new creation has the characteristics of a single organism. Our Lord transcends and possesses that organism in his eternal being as the Beloved Son. But he has also identified himself with it in his incarnate state, as the allegory of the True Vine clearly shows.¹ The language about the head and the body indicates that this identification carries with it a pre-eminence which transcends human conditions. But the same truth is really implied in the Pauline picture of the One Man and in the Johannine picture of the Vine. The Whole transcends in significance all the parts taken together. In this one organism, then, our Lord fulfilled his work of redemption once for all; in it also he continues to exercise his messianic functions for mankind. Now in his present glorified state our Lord must possess the capacity to exercise his life-giving powers throughout the redeemed order, howsoever it may be conditioned, in all its extent and in all its stages of manifestation. Nothing less than this will correspond to the reality of the spiritual body of him who became a life-giving spirit. When, however, we consider that redeemed order, we see that it has two aspects. For first, it draws its whole significance from the redeeming Lord as he exists now in the glory of his risen life. Secondly, the character of that order as redeemed depends upon the fact that he is able, as life-giving spirit, to impart the substance of his risen life to us now *in our present condition*. To the first of these aspects of the redeemed order corresponds the Lord's 'risen body'; to the second corresponds his 'mystical body', the Church.

¹ John 15¹⁻⁸; see also Additional Note D below, p. 320

Our present condition is in contrast to his present condition. By that fact is determined the character of the dispensation to which we now belong. All members of the Church belong, on this side of the final resurrection, to the dispensation of the Spirit whose beginning was indicated by the pentecostal outpouring. That dispensation, therefore, lies between the special manifestations of the first Eastertide on the one hand and the final glory of the risen life on the other. In that first Eastertide our Lord manifested himself as enjoying the condition which will become our inheritance in the risen life hereafter. He is now and evermore in the enjoyment of that condition for which we must wait. Yet the whole significance of the redeemed order, as at present conditioned for us, is drawn from the glory of his present state. But here a further discrimination is necessary. His present state as manifested in the risen body has two abiding features. Negatively, the risen Lord showed himself to have been set free for ever from all the limiting conditions of this present earthly life, as lived in the mortal body. Positively, however, he revealed in his appearances the essential identity which exists under transformed conditions as between the body of the risen life and the body which hung upon the Cross. For he showed in the risen body the wounds of his crucifixion. He showed the continuity of the new form with the old form to be of such a kind that the marks of sacrificial death have been taken up into the new life.

The life which is now set free for ever, both from the servitude of our mortal condition, and from the death in which that servitude terminates, is none the less identically the same life which was once poured out as a sacrificial libation unto death. About this there was nothing accidental, because sacrifice belongs to the essence of that life. It belonged to the divine plan that the Messiah should suffer. The inevitability of that suffering corresponded to the character of God.¹ That is the explanation of the emphatic identification made in the fourth gospel between the crucifixion and the glorification of Jesus.² The glory of God was most completely manifested in the death

¹ These sentences must be connected not only with Luke 24²⁶ (ἔδει παθεῖν), but also with John 1²⁹ (ὁ ἄλπων). The subject recurs in ensuing chapters, especially Chapter XIII.

² see above, pp. 249-252

upon the Cross; and the glory of that death was carried over into the risen life. The scars of the risen body are glorious as manifesting this fact. The glory of the risen life lies completely in this fact of sacrificial death carried over and taken up into a triumphantly new order of being.¹ At the heart of the risen life there is sacrifice. At its centre is all the wealth of a sacrificial love, both divine and human, which is perfect in sovereign power and in fulness of freedom to accomplish its purpose, because it has passed through the final ordeal of death.

Such is our Lord's present state as manifested in the risen body. Upon it depends the significance of the redeemed order in which we are set. For us that order is conditioned by the contrast between our present state and the spiritual fulness which we have just seen to be his. Our life as members of the mystical body is characterized by that contrast. He possesses 'all the fulness of the Godhead bodily'. His risen body is the sphere of that fulness. But 'in him ye are made full' (Col. 2^{9,10}); and the sphere of that filling is the mystical body. Both of these spheres are in him. Yet to our understanding they must be contrasted and distinguished. They are complementary aspects of the one divine-human organism which is Christ in his fulness.² In the thought of Colossians 2^{9,10} it seems clear that the mystical body is conceived to be like a vessel into which the life of Christ is poured. We are 'made full in him' because we receive the life which he pours into us. The Body grows through union with the Head (2¹⁹). Christ is 'in you, the hope of glory' (1²⁷) because his life circulates through the Body to the members. Moreover the life which so circulates flows from a full vessel. 'For in him dwells all the fulness of the Godhead in a bodily manner.' The Church is the 'fulness' of Christ (Eph. 1²³) because 'of his fulness we all received', and he is 'full of grace and truth' (John 1^{16,14}).

We must interpret the language of Colossians 1²⁴ in the light of these considerations.³ The rendering: 'that which is lacking of the afflictions of Christ' (RV) might suggest that there

¹ to which there is no real parallel in ancient sacrificial ideas; see further below, pp. 384, 387

² so that in this passage 'bodily' has two aspects corresponding to the twofold use of the expression: 'in him'. The fulness is 'in him' *corporally* (the risen body); but also, in respect of our being 'made full', the fulness is 'in him' *corporately* (the mystical body).

³ The passage is quoted in full on p. 35 above

was a deficiency in the sufferings which Christ endured in his Passion, as though his mediatorial work was insufficient. If that were really true, nothing that St. Paul could do or suffer would make the slightest difference to the fatal defect. Moreover, if St. Paul had actually taught the Colossians that the sufferings of Christ needed to be supplemented, he would have undercut the whole argument of this epistle and played straight into the hands of the false teachers whom he was opposing. They had said that other mediators were needed; and in reply this letter is a sustained argument for believing that in Christ there is 'the whole fulness'. An impossible interpretation is avoided if we understand 'the afflictions of the Christ' to be 'in *my* flesh'. The sufferings 'in the body of *his* flesh' (1²²) sufficed to reconcile the whole of creation to God (1²⁰). But since there is one organism of the incarnate Lord, there is identity of life between him and his members. This means that his sufferings are shared by them and reproduced in them. Not only the 'comfort' of his sufferings, but the sufferings themselves 'overflow unto us'.¹ His sufferings belong to that sacrificial life which has passed over through death into his risen body. They belong to that 'fulness' from which we are 'made full in him' (2^{9,10}).

St. Paul believed that the sacrificial life of the Christ overflows into the mystical body, so that the sufferings endured by our Lord in his Passion are reproduced in the Church. To the scars in the risen body correspond 'the afflictions of the Messiah' in the mystical body. His conflict with sin is reproduced in us because we are the hands with which he inflicts defeat upon the powers of darkness in this present world. But his victory is also reproduced in us. His sufferings were fruitful; and this fact was manifested when the scars of those sufferings decked the glory of the returning conqueror on Easter-day. This explains St. Paul's joy in his sufferings as a prisoner of Christ Jesus. A certain measure of the 'afflictions of the Christ in my flesh' remain to be completed. They were part and parcel of his warfare on behalf of the mystical body as an apostle of Christ. The sufferings of the Christ are a spiritual treasure which enriches the Church. To partake of them is to partake of Christ's fulness.²

¹ 2 Cor. 1⁵; on both passages see further above, pp. 34, 35 and notes

² Essentially the same truth is stated more fully in 2 Cor. 4⁷⁻¹⁵. The light of the glory of God in Christ (v. 6) is the treasure carried in the vessel of the

The Church partakes of the fulness of the risen life. But the essence of that life is sacrificial. The stream which flows from the risen body into the mystical body is a sacrificial stream.¹

The Church, then, as the mystical body is the fulness of Christ, because the fulness which is in the Head flows into the Body. Whichever way Ephesians 1²³ is rendered, this must be its primary meaning.² Christ is filled with God and the Church is filled with Christ. The Church, therefore, is not filled directly with the Godhead. Between pure deity and redeemed humanity stands the 'one mediator between God and men, himself man, Christ Jesus' (1 Tim. 2⁵). We are filled with the divine-human life of Jesus in his mystical body. This is made clear in Ephesians 3¹⁹, where the writer prays 'that ye may be strengthened to know the love of the Christ which passes knowledge, that ye may be filled unto all the fulness of God'. Notwithstanding the emphasis which this epistle lays upon knowledge, the writer counts its highest form to be the knowledge of Christ's love,—the personal knowledge which depends upon sympathy and community of character. This is the wisdom which has access to and insight into Christ's love. Such wisdom comes from 'the Spirit of wisdom and revelation' bestowed by 'the Father of glory' (1¹⁷). So too in the prayer which we are now considering the order of thought is similar. The Father bestows the power of the Spirit; Christ dwells in the heart; that indwelling gives knowledge of Christ's

apostle's body (v. 7). To carry this illumination is to carry about 'the dying of Jesus in my body' (v. 10). His passion and resurrection are reproduced 'in our mortal flesh' (v. 11); and the sacrifice is fruitful for the Church (v. 12). For *παραδιδόμεθα* (v. 11) see Additional Note A, p. 284 above.

¹ The sequence of thought in the above paragraph corresponds broadly to the argument of Col. 1²⁴⁻²¹⁰.

² The main difficulty lies in the rendering of *πληρουμένον*. Dr. Moffatt translates: 'the church which is his Body, filled by him who fills the universe entirely.' W. L. Knox, on the other hand, has 'that which is filled by Him who is always being filled' (*op. cit.*, p. 186, n. 3). The meaning is that our Lord is able to fill the Church because as 'the Wisdom-Logos' he is himself 'continually being filled with God' (Col. 1¹⁹, 2⁹). The same author points out that in Hellenistic thought 'the *cosmos* was the *pleroma* of gods and men: the sphere which they filled completely' (*ib.*, p. 163). If the author of Ephesians used *pleroma* in a parallel sense, he must have meant that the Church was the *pleroma* of Christ because the Church, as his Body, is the sphere which he, as the Wisdom-Logos, fills completely.

love, and so finally we are 'filled unto all the fulness of God' (3¹⁶⁻¹⁹).

In the mystical body we partake of God's fulness through communion with the indwelling Christ in the power of his Spirit. Attention must now be drawn to a certain paradox of language in Ephesians, of the kind which appears so often in the Pauline writings. The Church is the fulness of Christ (1²³). Yet it is thought necessary to pray for the members of the Church 'that ye may be filled' (3¹⁹). A fuller interpretation of these contrasted truths is set forth in chapter 4. Christ, as head of the Church, fills not only the Church, but also the whole universe. The writer sees in our Lord's Ascension an assurance that this is true. By descending to the depths¹ and then ascending to the highest heaven Christ has claimed the whole universe as his rightful possession. He has conquered all hostile powers in the universe and is able to share the spoils of victory with his followers (4⁸⁻¹⁰). We also are 'seated with him in the heavenly places in Christ Jesus' (2⁶).² It might be supposed that nothing more could be added to this. Yet the writer goes on to explain that the 'gifts' bestowed by the ascended Christ are gifts of grace for the fulfilment of ministerial functions in the mystical body.³ The ascended Church of Ephesians is still that same Body of Christ which is described in 1 Corinthians and Romans. Unity in Christ does not eliminate growth, nor dangers hostile to the growth of the Body.

The dangers which are here in view are described in 4¹⁴. They are dangers of false teaching, such as are dealt with more fully in Colossians. The writer finds a safeguard against destructive errors in the wealth of ministerial organs which the ascended Lord bestowed upon the Church. The unity of the Body is divinely grounded and furnished. Yet constant vigilance is required to secure it (4¹⁻⁷). Accordingly the saints are to be equipped through teaching and pastoral care. The work of the ministry is essentially one of 'edification'. The Body of the Christ needs 'building up' with the right kind of nourishment. Error can beguile only the immature Christian (vv. 11, 12, 14). The goal of this process of edification is described in verse 13.

¹ Apparently the 'descent into hell' is referred to in Eph. 4⁹

² cp. also 1²⁰⁻²³

³ With 4⁷ and 4^{11ff} compare 1 Cor. 12^{28ff} and Rom. 12^{6ff}

It is to continue until 'we all attain unto the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God unto a full-grown man, unto the measure of the maturity of the fulness of the Christ'. Unity of faith, knowledge and life is beyond the power of human nature. The discord of the universe is reproduced in the discord of the human heart and the consequent discord of mankind.¹ But Christ in whom all things cohere has reconciled these discordant elements.² In this epistle the standing example of this reconciliation is the uniting of Jew and Gentile in Christ. 'For he is our peace who made both one . . . that he might create the two in himself into one new man' (2¹⁴⁻¹⁶).

The 'new man' of 2¹⁵ and the 'full-grown man' of 4¹³ are not quite the same as 'the One Man' of Romans 5¹⁵ into whom we were grafted. The writer in Ephesians seems to be thinking in terms of a political metaphor of 'corporate personality'.³ The new social unity of the Church, however, is not of human origin. Christ created it 'in himself' (2¹⁵) and its whole growth depends upon him. This dependence is stated in the passage under consideration (4¹³⁻¹⁶) in two ways. Christ is (i) the measure of Christian maturity and (ii) the source from which maturity comes. The first of these two ideas is stated in verse 13 and repeated in verse 15. The second idea, namely that Christ is the source of maturity, concludes the whole section in verse 16. The second of these two conceptions was first stated in Colossians 2¹⁹, of which Ephesians 4¹⁶ is a variant. It is simply the doctrine that the life of the mystical body flows from the Head. The building up of the Church 'in love' comes from Christ who is the fount of sacrificial love. We are made full in him.

In the present passage, however, this repetition of teaching given in Colossians (2^{10,19}) follows upon a complementary truth which is more characteristic of Ephesians. Christ as the Head sums up the universe and the Church in himself (1¹⁰). Because he is 'the first' he is also 'the last'.⁴ We can never get beyond him. All growth in the Church is a growing up 'into him' or 'unto him' (4¹⁵). By growing 'into' his likeness we grow up 'unto the measure of the maturity' which is in him (4¹³). This is

¹ see above, pp. 294, 295 and pp. 94, 95

² Col. 1^{17,20}

³ so Knox, *op. cit.*, p. 196, and n. 1

⁴ cp. pp. 296, 297 above

equally true of the Church as a whole and of the individuals who are members of the Body. The welfare of the Church depends upon this growth to a maturity which already exists in Christ. For he is both the standard and the goal towards which all growth is directed. The unity of the Church in faith and knowledge depends upon its maturity. Immature Christians are unstable. They are blown about and sway backwards and forwards with every blast of doctrine, because they have no weighty ballast of truth in them. The immature cannot grasp the fulness of Christ, nor distinguish it from the emptiness of error. Thus though the Church, as the mystical body, is filled with Christ, the immaturity of the members hinders them from receiving the fulness. Thereby the Church is impoverished and the unity of the Body threatened.

A human body functions as a living whole, if there is soundness in all the parts. For the harmonious life of the whole depends upon the right functioning of every part in relation to the whole and to every other part. In a sick body there is friction between the parts and consequently the harmony, strength and beauty of the whole are largely stultified, even though all the resources for these excellences are actually present in the body. Thus the beauty of Christ's love and the significance of his person and work are actually obscured through the sins of Christians and through the divisions of the Church. The fulness of these treasures is always present in the Church. Yet that fulness is never fully manifested to the faith of believers; still less to the understanding of the outside world. Within the greater vessel, the mystical body, there is the fulness of the grace and truth that are in Jesus. Yet this fulness can be manifested in terms of our human nature only so far as the lesser vessels, contained within the greater vessel, are so ordered as to receive that fulness 'in the measure which belongs to each several part' (v. 16). Moreover this partaking of the fulness is not quantitative, but functional. Each member of the Church can receive the fulness and manifest it only according to his 'measure' which may be presumed to be the same as 'the measure of the gift of the Christ' (v. 7).¹

¹ 'The lesser vessels', that is the individual members of the Body, together make up a *pleroma* or 'totality' in another possible meaning of that word. They are the necessary 'complement' of Christ in the greater vessel, 'the

It must therefore be recognised that in this epistle there are two senses in which the Church is the fulness of Christ. In the primary sense the Church is the fulness because the mystical body is like a vessel into which the fulness of Christ is poured. He fills it with himself. In the secondary sense, however, the Church may be called the fulness of Christ because that fulness cannot be manifested amongst men without or apart from the human vessel which contains it. As Christ is the indispensable mediator of God's fulness, so the Church is the indispensable container of Christ's fulness. On the first view the Church is empty apart from Christ; on the second view Christ is inaccessible without the Church. The Church apart from Christ would be like an empty wine-cup. Christ without the Church would be like wine which, for lack of a wine-cup, no one could drink. To conceive of the Church apart from Christ is like thinking of an empty jewel-case. So Christ without the Church would be like precious treasure hidden, buried, or inaccessible.

The Church has such significance as being no merely human organisation, but the household of God and the redeemed family of mankind. Apart from the Church God would be the heavenly Father without an earthly family. His Beloved Son would still be the firstborn of the Father, but not 'amongst many brethren'. In God's plan for creation man alone is said to have been made in the divine image. So only through this created image can God's likeness be printed upon his creation. Throughout the Bible man is nothing apart from God; yet man is apparently indispensable to the carrying out of God's plan. From the call of Abraham onwards the people of God is the instrument through which the divine purpose is fulfilled. So there is no Messiah without Israel, no incarnation of the Word without the co-operation of a Virgin Mother, no Christ without the Church, no fulness of Christ apart from his mystical body.

many' who as a series make up 'the all' in 'the One'. Starting from the prophetic and dominical word 'many' (Isa. 53¹¹, Mark 10⁴⁵, 14²⁴) we find the following sequence: 'the many', 'the all' (1 Cor. 10¹⁷), 'one' and 'many' (1 Cor. 12^{13, 14, 20}), 'the all' (2 Cor. 5¹⁴), 'all' are 'one' (Gal. 3²⁸), 'the many', 'the One' (Rom. 5¹⁵⁻¹⁹), 'the many' (Rom. 12⁵), 'the all' (Eph. 4¹³). The two meanings of *pleroma*: (i) the total series of divine qualities or powers and (ii) the total series of Christ's human members, may well be present together in the thought of Col. 1²⁴, Eph. 1²³, 4¹³, but especially in Col. 2^{9, 10} (see above, p. 304 and n. 2).

There can be no knowledge of God amongst men except through a holy community in which they can see God's love in some measure reflected, and no dwelling of God amongst men unless there be a human temple in which he can take up his abode. 'The light of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ' is a light before which all created splendours are dimmed. Yet 'we have this treasure in earthen vessels that the exceeding greatness of the power may be of God and not from ourselves.'¹

God's plan requires a human torch with which to display the light of his glory in creation,² a human shrine in which his sacrifice of love may be offered, human material with which to kindle the sacrificial flame. The wisdom of God in Christ is made known to all created spirits; but the Church is the indispensable bearer of the message (Eph. 3¹⁰). The truth, 'even as truth is in Jesus' (4²¹),³ is communicated to mankind only through redeemed men, as it was originally communicated to redeemed men through the Man who is our redeemer. The truth of God's love was made known to the first disciples by him who is the Truth.⁴ So now it is made known to the world only through those who 'hold by the truth' (4¹⁵ M). For this message can be handed on only by those who partake of its sincerity and reality, and so have insight into its mystery. Our Lord told Pilate that he came into the world to bear witness to the truth. This he did through his having become Truth incarnate, with the consequence that 'everyone who is of the truth heareth my voice'.⁵ His voice is heard in the Gospel and in the Church and in neither apart from the other. If the Gospel is truly heard in the Church, then the Church will truly embody the Gospel. If the Gospel is not heard and embodied in the Church, it will be neither heard nor embodied anywhere else.

In Ephesians 4^{15, 16} there is twice repeated the phrase 'in love' which is a favourite expression in this epistle.⁶ In four out of the six places where it occurs there is some doubt as to its precise

¹ 2 Cor. 4^{6, 7}; see above, p. 305, n. 2

² With 2 Cor. 4⁷ compare the human luminaries in Phil. 2¹⁵

³ On this use of the holy name see JAR, p. 107

⁴ John 14⁶

⁵ John 18³⁷

⁶ 1⁴⁽⁵⁾, 3¹⁷⁽¹⁸⁾, 4^{2(3), 15, 16}, 5²; on the first two of these see pp. 173 ff and 179, 180, 306

connexion with its context; and that is so in 4¹⁵. But in any case there is a close connexion here between 'truth' and 'love', and of both with growing up wholly into Christ.¹ This is deeply significant. The unity of the Body is preserved 'in love' (4²); and to 'walk in love' is to imitate God (5¹). We know this because 'the Christ loved you and delivered himself up for you, an offering and a sacrifice to God for an odour of a sweet smell' (5²). Imitating God means following the model of conduct exhibited in Christ's sacrifice; for we know God's love in Christ's sacrifice.² So too 'in love' occurs in 3¹⁴⁻¹⁹ in a similar connexion of thought.³ Again in 4¹⁶ through union with Christ as the Head the Body grows 'unto the building up of itself in love'. Now whether 'in love' means 'in our love' or 'in Christ's love' in these passages cannot always be determined. What is significant is the fact that the phrase might mean either. We can 'walk in love' or 'deal truly in love' or 'forbear in love' or 'grow in love' only if we are in Christ, who is the Beloved Son and so Love incarnate. We can 'deal truly in love' (RV margin) only if we 'hold by the truth' (M) of God's love in Christ (4¹⁵). The fulness of God's love is in the Beloved Son, and was most completely manifested in his sacrifice upon the Cross.⁴ So if we think of 'the fulness of Christ' in its primary meaning it signifies that the Church is filled with the sacrificial love of the Beloved Son. For the Father pours his love into the Son, and the Son responds in love to the Father. This loving response of the Son to the Father was manifested and embodied upon the Cross. Finally this sacrificial response with its fragrant odour fills the Church and thence ascends to the Father. So if we 'walk in love' we are walking in the love of Christ, which fills heaven as it fills the Church of God.

But again, there is the secondary meaning of 'the fulness'. Men cannot recognise the truth of the Gospel unless they see it embodied in the Church. The torch of truth displaying the glory of God's love is both Christ on the Cross and also the crucified Lord uplifted in the Church. So long as this dispensa-

¹ ἐν ἀγάπῃ may be taken with ἀληθεύοντες; so AV, RV text and margin, Abbott (ICC), JAR and Scott (M). The text of M, however, connects the phrase with what follows.

² cp. Rom. 5⁵⁻⁸, John 3¹⁴⁻¹⁶

³ see above, p. 311, n. 6

⁴ see above, pp. 249ff

tion lasts Christ embodied in his Church is the only torch of Gospel truth which men have.¹ 'Dealing truly' is more than 'speaking the truth'; though often the second will be the supreme test of the first. Truth, 'even as truth is in Jesus', is the reality of God's love embodied in his incarnate Son. That is the fulness of God in Christ. Free access to this fulness exists in Christ. But it is open to mankind in the Church just so far as the Church is strengthened 'to know the love of Christ which passes knowledge'. For to possess such knowledge is to become conformed to what we know. By gazing into the magic mirror of the Spirit we reflect its glory (2 Cor. 3¹⁸). That is the fulness of Christ in the Church. The Church is the embodiment of Christ, as Christ incarnate is the embodiment of God. It was into this twofold mystery that the Church was initiated by her Lord.² Yet the initiation leaves the Bride standing over against the Bridegroom. He cleansed and consecrated her that he might present her to himself, 'not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing; but that she should be holy and without blemish' (Eph. 5^{26, 27}). Clothed in the fulness of his sacrifice she is able to make her response to his love. It is only as the embodiment of his sacrificial love that she can truly fulfil her vocation and mission as his bride. The 'identity in distinction'³ between the mystical body and the One Man is an identity best understood in terms of personal union. For this is always the highest kind of identity. The divine-human *koinonia* between Christ and the Church issues from and reproduces the divine *koinonia* between the Father and the Son. By communion with her Lord the Church shares his thoughts⁴ and partakes of his sacrifice. Thus she is 'holy and without blemish',—a consecrated person. Beholding the glory of the uplifted Son of Man,⁵ the initiated bride becomes that which in faith she confesses, the embodied sacrifice of love.

When the Word became flesh, the second Adam became 'one flesh' with his bride.⁶ In a complementary sense she became

¹ This sentence must be understood in a sense compatible with the claims of Scripture as the Word of God. For Christ will not be truly embodied where those claims are not fully acknowledged. See above, pp. 3, 4.

² see above, Chapter VIII

³ see above, pp. 299ff

⁴ 1 Cor. 2¹⁶

⁵ cp. pp. 249ff above

⁶ John 1¹⁴, Eph. 5^{31, 32}

'one flesh' with him through initiation into his life, death and resurrection.¹ So by membership in the mystical body we are incorporated into the One Man. For the Body stands for the whole Man and is identical with him in one aspect of the divine-human organism.² When the necessary distinctions have been made it becomes clear that the unity of the one divine-human organism is the deeper truth in which all the distinctions are included. To say that we have identity with him in that unity is an indispensable form of speech which St. Paul did not hesitate to use concerning his own relationship to the indwelling Christ.³ That relationship was shown in Chapter V to be one of mystical identity which, so far from involving supersession of personality, actually enhanced it. It is this identity between Christ and the Church which is so strongly emphasized in St. John's Gospel. The clearest example is the allegory of the Vine. But there are also other passages, where this truth seems to be deliberately indicated.

There are two alternative interpretations of John 1¹⁴ open to us. This situation arises from an ambiguity in the language used at one point, namely, in the second phrase.⁴ This is rendered 'dwelt among us' (RV). 'Tabernacled' would be more accurate, as the marginal note points out.⁵ By becoming flesh the Word pitched his tent amongst us. It was a tent of 'flesh'. Thus his mortal body became a new tabernacle which replaced the Jewish temple. It was the antitype of which the original tabernacle in the wilderness was a type. With this agrees the statement in 2²¹: 'he spake concerning the temple⁶ of his body.' Now in John 1¹⁻¹⁸ the Logos-doctrine has associations both with the biblical language about 'the word of God' and also with the figure of Wisdom as used by St. Paul. The latter association is

¹ see above, Chapters VIII and IX

² see above, pp. 253-256, 264, 298-300, 302, 303 for the argument summarized in this sentence. See also Additional Note D, p. 320.

³ Gal. 2²⁰; see above, pp. 147-155, especially p. 153

⁴ ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν. For the details of what follows see Bernard, pp. 20 ff.

⁵ 'Tarried among us' (M) misses the reference to the tabernacle, and to God's permanent dwelling amongst his people (the Shekinah). For detailed O.T. references see Bernard, *ad loc.*; cp. also p. 212 above.

⁶ ναός = the sanctuary proper, not the whole of the sacred enclosure (ιερόν)

significant for the interpretation which we are considering. Wisdom has her 'throne in the pillar of cloud'¹ which 'descended and stood at the door of the tabernacle'.² 'When the cloud covered the tent of meeting' and 'abode thereon' then 'the glory of the Lord filled the tabernacle'.³ So the eye-witnesses beheld the glory of God's presence in the Word incarnate, 'such glory as the only Son of the Eternal Father would derive from Him and so could exhibit to the faithful'.⁴

Another interpretation, however, adopted by some Greek Fathers renders the phrase 'dwelt in us'.⁵ This would mean that when the Word became flesh he took humanity as his tabernacle. When he put on a mortal body he put on humanity as such. So we also belong to the tabernacle which he made to be his dwelling-place. By becoming incarnate he dwelt in us; for we belong to that nature which he took. This rendering has the effect of including *within the mystery of the Incarnation* the truth that the Church is the temple of God,⁶ instead of making the latter a corollary of the former. The doctrine of the Church as the Body of Christ becomes a part or aspect of the doctrine of the Incarnation. This view gives a new significance to the 'tabernacle' in relation to the 'congregation'.⁷ The congregation⁸ of the new Israel is included in the area of the tabernacle. For in virtue of his presence in the tabernacle God dwells among them and walks among them.⁹ The presence of the Word incarnate in the central shrine of his mortal body¹⁰ made the whole surrounding camp of the new Israel to be already his dwelling-place. In virtue of this fact the disciples were already the *ecclesia*. This interpretation agrees perfectly with the allegory of the Vine and also with St. Paul's doctrine of the One Man, the risen Lord, in whom we are included. For after the resurrection the risen body became the central shrine, while the mystical body corresponds to the surrounding camp.

¹ Ecclus. 24⁴; cp. vv. 8, 10 of the same chapter and Exod. 13²¹, 14^{19, 24}

² Exod. 33⁹

³ Exod. 40^{34, 35}

⁴ Bernard, p. 24

⁵ giving to the preposition *ἐν* its proper meaning

⁶ 1 Cor. 3¹⁶, 6¹⁹, 2 Cor. 6¹⁶, Eph. 2^{21, 22}, 1 Pet. 2⁵

⁷ see Exod. 25⁸, 29⁴²⁻⁴⁶, and Lev. 26^{11, 12}

⁸ *ἐκκλησία*

⁹ 2 Cor. 6^{16b} and references given in n. 7 above

¹⁰ see above, p. 314, n. 6.

This conception illuminates the doctrine of Ephesians 5^{31, 32} that Christ and the Church are 'one flesh', and agrees with St. Paul's statement 'that one died for all, therefore all died' (2 Cor. 5¹⁴). The mystical body was implicitly included within the mortal body from the first. But on this view of the phrase in John 1¹⁴, what meaning can be given to the following phrase: 'we beheld his glory'? For this was not mystical vision, but the sensible vision of eye-witnesses.¹ On this ground the first interpretation must be considered to be the most natural and obvious. The evangelist must have intended the *prima facie* interpretation to be the primary one; this also fits in best with his obvious emphasis upon the importance of eye-witnesses to the historical facts of the gospel story. But the language is ambiguous and perhaps deliberately so. Under cover of an explicit statement the evangelist seems to be hinting at a wider application of the truth stated. In that case the phrase: 'we beheld his glory' gives no further difficulty; for it also contains a secondary suggestion.

We have seen that this evangelist, in his treatment of the brazen serpent and the Servant prophecy, took pains to suggest that the glory of Jesus on the Cross was veiled to all but believers.² Now the eye-witnesses referred to in John 1¹⁴ were all believers. The fact that they beheld the glory of the Only-begotten Son is not to be attributed solely to the fact that he 'dwelt among' them in daily intercourse. Judas had the same opportunities in this respect as his fellow-disciples.³ In becoming flesh however our Lord tabernacled in human nature as such. He had, in becoming man, secured for himself an entry into the entire human race. So when he delivered his message his word entered human hearts and created belief.⁴ Whenever that happened the Word dwelling 'in us' caused 'us' to see the glory of the Only-begotten Son. In principle it is still happening, although to those who are not literally eye-witnesses. For the original eye-witnesses were representative of all believers. If we see 'the glory' we see it through their eyes with the help of the written word.⁵ The Church as the fulness of Christ is like a con-

¹ Bernard has collected the evidence for the Johannine usage (p. 21)

² above, pp. 250-252 ³ cp. also John 7⁵ ⁴ see above, pp. 248, 249

⁵ in accordance with the promises to Nathanael in 1^{50, 51} and to Martha in 11⁴⁰, where spiritual vision is indicated

tainer, an 'earthen vessel' filled with 'this treasure' (2 Cor. 4⁷). But the container is not of fixed unchanging size. From another point of view it is an aspect of that one divine-human organism which is divinely complete, yet which grows in its human material. Potentially that organism includes the whole human race in its Christ-filled maturity (Eph. 4¹³). The original eye-witnesses included implicitly all believers, because all are included in Christ.

In 2¹³⁻²² the evangelist records a story of our Lord 'cleansing' the temple near the feast of the passover (v. 13). When he saw men making profit out of the sacred cultus and thus desecrating the festival of deliverance from the bondage of Egypt, the Beloved Son pronounced judgement upon Israel's apostasy: 'Take these things hence; make not my Father's house a house of merchandise' (v. 16). The disciples, it is implied, recognized the act as messianic; for we are told that they recalled some words of a psalm (69⁹), afterwards applied to our Lord's Passion by the primitive Church. His protest against the desecration of the temple was to be a contributory cause of his death.¹ When challenged by the Jews, our Lord simply continues the prophetic doom of verse 16: 'Destroy this sanctuary, if you must; my Father's own house turned into a place of gain!' Yet the temple of stone was only a symbol of the true temple, Israel.² Their misuse of the outward symbol typified their state of mind. They were destroying the congregation which the shrine represented. It seems, therefore, more than probable that in the second half of the saying in verse 19 our Lord is represented as referring to the raising up of the new Israel on the ruins of the old within the 'three days' of Hosea's prophecy.³ The same prophecy may have influenced his predictions of his resurrection as recorded in the other gospels, in accordance with a divine plan which included both prophecy and fulfilment.

But if so, the saying in John 2¹⁹ would mean for Jesus a re-creation of Israel through the medium of his own death and

¹ Bernard (p. 92) finds a change of tense in the quotation in v. 17 (*καταφάγεται* for *κατέφαγεν*). Cp. the accusation in Mark 14⁵⁸. This perhaps preserves in a twisted form some genuine words of our Lord, which were echoed by St. Stephen (Acts 6¹⁴, 7⁴⁸⁻⁵⁰).

² cp. the references given in n. 7 on p. 315 above. The whole scene is foreshadowed in Jer. 7¹⁻¹⁵, from which the synoptic parallels quote v. 11.

³ Hos. 6²

resurrection. A new paschal deliverance was at hand. Once more Israel would come out of the house of bondage, and God would dwell among them. But the expression: 'I will raise it up' is enigmatic. It may correspond to: 'I have power to take it again' in 10¹⁸. For our Lord knew himself to be the true Israel (the Vine). So the saying in verse 19 might mean: 'If you destroy Israel, I will raise it again from the tomb by my victory over death.'¹ The saying is, therefore, highly ambiguous. At first sight the comment of the evangelist seems, by contrast, to be completely free from ambiguity (v. 21): 'but he was speaking about the sanctuary of his body.' The word used here for 'body' is always used by this writer elsewhere in reference to a dead body; and in all other cases except one it refers to our Lord's dead body.² The evangelist is saying that our Lord was referring to his mortal body. If destroyed by the Jews, he would raise it from the tomb on the third day. This is confirmed by the final comment of verse 22. When 'he was raised from the dead' the disciples remembered this saying of our Lord 'and believed the scripture and the word which Jesus said'. The writer may, indeed, be referring in advance to his statement in 20^{8,9}. In any case 'the scripture' in both passages must be Psalm 16¹⁰, which could refer only to our Lord's body raised from the tomb.³

The phrase 'the temple of his body' in verse 21 contains two words used in the Pauline epistles: *naos* and *soma*. In 1 Corinthians Christians are the temple (*naos*) of God (3¹⁶) and Christ is the body (*soma*) of which we are members (12¹²). The Church is also called the body (*soma*) of Christ in the earlier and later senses explained in the present chapter. But Christ is only once called 'the temple' in the New Testament.⁴ In John 1¹⁴, however, on either interpretation, the Incarnation is described in language drawn from the Mosaic tabernacle. The Word made human nature to be his tabernacle in which he dwells, as God 'dwelt' in the Mosaic tabernacle. To this the language of 2²¹ exactly corresponds; our Lord's *body* is the temple of God. Now

¹ Bernard (p. 95) cites the evidence of 10¹⁸, but ignores its significance

² *σῶμα* (19^{31, 38, 40}, 20¹²); on this see further, pp. 422-424 below

³ see above, p. 259, n. 5

⁴ in Rev. 21²², on which see below, pp. 342 ff, and 407 ff. In Matt. 12⁶ our Lord says with reference to himself: 'a greater thing than the temple (*ἱερόν*) is here.' See above, p. 314, n. 6.

the evangelist must have known that for St. Paul the Church, as the Body of Christ, is the temple of God. His statement about the body of Jesus, once mortal and now risen, is deliberately couched in language used by St. Paul in reference to the mystical body.¹ Once again, therefore, the ambiguity is significant. The evangelist wishes us to understand that the enigmatic form of our Lord's saying about the temple (2¹⁹) indicates simultaneously two aspects of his 'body'. When Christ's body was raised from the tomb, we too were raised. For we, Christ's members, are included in that body, 'made without hands', which was nailed to the Cross and raised 'in three days'.

One more instance of Johannine 'ambiguity' is relevant. In 7³⁷⁻³⁹ our Lord promised to the believer that living water of the Spirit, which he had once offered to a Samaritan woman.² In verse 38 the saying: 'out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water' may refer either to Christ or to the believer. The alternatives arise partly from an uncertainty about the punctuation. Once again a comparison with 1 Corinthians may prove significant. According to that epistle Christ was formerly the Rock from which water flowed for Israel in the desert (10⁴). Now he is the one Body whose members together are the temple of the Holy Spirit, as their bodies through that same membership are severally temples of the Spirit (12¹², 3¹⁶, 6¹⁵, 19). Through baptism into that Body by the one Spirit we were all imbued with the one Spirit (12¹³), bestowed by him who became a life-giving spirit (15⁴⁵). Within the One Body which is the temple of God³ the waters of the Spirit flow into the believer, so that his soul becomes a garden watered with the pentecostal outpouring.⁴ As there is mystical identity between the Vine and its branches, and between Christ and St. Paul, so also between the Body of Christ and the body of the believer.⁵ The river flowing from Christ's Body is like the oil in the widow's pot.⁶ It is multiplied inexhaustibly in many vessels. Yet all of these are one. The one

¹ In Ephesians, where the 'distinctions' have become explicit, two different words are used. in 2¹⁵, 16 the mortal body (σάρξ) is distinguished from the mystical body (σῶμα); cp. Col. 1²², 24

² 4¹⁰⁻¹⁵; see Bernard, pp. 138-142, 280-285; and cp. above, pp. 89-95

³ 3¹⁶; cp. Eph. 2²⁰⁻²²

⁴ 12¹³; cp. Rom. 5⁵

⁵ John 15¹, Gal. 2²⁰, Col. 1²⁴

⁶ 2 Kings 4¹⁻⁷

vessel is Christ's Body in which all are included. It is that temple from which issue living waters.¹ Ultimately it is 'the throne of God and of the Lamb.'²

Additional Note C.

The tabernacle in Luke 1³⁵

The language of John 1¹⁴ and 2²¹ should be compared with that of Luke 1³⁵. Our Lord's Body is a sanctuary in which God dwells. The sanctuary was created, when the Word became flesh and tabernacled in human nature. That nature he took from his Mother; and to that event there was a fitting prelude, which St. Luke records in the story of the Annunciation. Mary heard the words: 'The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee and the power of the Most High shall overshadow thee' (ἐπισκιάσει σοι). The word ἐπισκιάζω is used by all three synoptists in their accounts of the Transfiguration. St. Peter proposed to make three tabernacles (σκηνάς). Then came a cloud 'overshadowing' them (Mark 9⁷, Luke 9³⁴, Matt. 17⁵); and 'they feared as they entered into the cloud' from which came the Voice (Luke 9^{34, 35}). In Exod. 40³⁵ the cloud of the divine presence 'abode' upon the tabernacle (LXX renders שָׁכַן by ἐπισκιάζω). When the cloud overshadowed it, the tabernacle (σκηνή) was filled with the glory of the Lord. So St. Luke tells us that through the overshadowing presence of God's Spirit Mary became a tabernacle in which God dwelt. The *Shekinah* entered her, when she conceived him who possesses the full glory of the *Shekinah*.

Additional Note D.

The organism of the Incarnate Lord

'By membership in the mystical body we are incorporated into the One Man. For the Body stands for the whole Man and is identical with him in one aspect of the divine-human organism.' This statement (p. 314) is perhaps the nearest approach to a definition in the present work. As such it may be taken as balancing a number of definitions offered in a previous work (*The Incarnate Lord*, pp. 232, 239, 282, 420 and note, 422-3). Precisely because he is God incarnate our Lord is, in St. Paul's phrase, 'the One Man' in whom God's purpose for all men is fulfilled. As he is the Logos-Creator there can be no true humanity apart from him or except in him; and as he is the Logos incarnate it may be truly said that he is the only completely human being who has ever existed. As the Word made flesh he describes himself in these words: 'a man who has spoken to you the truth which I heard from God' (John 8⁴⁰). He is the only man

¹ Ezek. 47¹; cp. Zech. 14⁸

² Rev. 22¹

who has spoken to us the whole truth about God and man; and it is only through incorporation into him that we may hope to have that truth fulfilled in ourselves.

Although as God incarnate he most properly described himself as 'a man', yet *as God the Word* he is not a man but the Second Person of the Holy Trinity. This was precisely my meaning when I wrote: 'He is not Himself an organism' (*The Incarnate Lord*, p. 239; cp. 'not in Himself a finite individual', *ib.*, p. 420). Those words were a simple repudiation of the notion that the divine *hypostasis* of God the Word is, *as such*, subject to the finite relativities of the creature, that deity is inherently characterized by mutability, as pagan polytheists have supposed, or by growth and development, as evolutionary monists have imagined. It is not too much to say that the repudiation of such notions is fundamental to Christian theology and an indispensable preliminary to understanding the doctrine of the Incarnation. But 'the Word became flesh'. He who possesses eternally the divine immutability entered into our creaturely relations and conditions. That which he was not in his eternal existence he became for our sakes in his incarnate state. It is with this complementary truth that we are here concerned, the truth concerning the divine-human organism of the incarnate Lord.

As 'a man' he is, in his incarnate state, 'an organism' and therefore also 'a human individual', 'a Jew of the first century A.D.' Yet all this is true precisely because 'in himself', in his eternal being, he cannot be described in any such terms. All these statements, then, are true of him in a unique sense. As 'an organism' he is the only spiritual organism in whom all other spiritual organisms can be included, the One Man in whom we all are, or may be, included. This is so because he is not *just* an organism, as we are, but God incarnate, the divine-human organism,—perfectly human only because he is truly divine. In his Godhead he *possesses* the organism of the new creation; in his manhood he *is* the organism of the new creation. The mystical body 'is identical with him in one aspect of the divine-human organism' precisely because in another aspect he is also the Head. He is identified with us and we with him in the one organism, the Body which 'stands for the whole Man'. But this is true only because he, as the Head, transcends all who are included in him. He is the true Israel to which we belong, the Vine of which we are branches, tended by his Father, the Husbandman. But this is so only because he is the Beloved Son sent to the vineyard, the Son who is recorded to have said: 'I and the Father are one.'

CHAPTER XI

THE BODY AND BLOOD OF CHRIST

There remains one important passage of Scripture in which the *koinonia* language occurs. It runs as follows:

The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a *communion* of¹ the blood of Christ? The bread² which we break, is it not a *communion* of³ the body of Christ? seeing that we, who are many, are one bread², one body³: for we all *partake* of⁴ the one bread².

Behold Israel after the flesh: have not they which eat the sacrifices *communion* with the altar? What say I then? that a thing sacrificed to idols is anything, or that an idol is anything? But I say, that the things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils⁵, and not to God: and I would not that ye should have *communion* with devils⁵. Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord, and the cup of devils⁵: ye cannot *partake* of the table of the Lord, and of the table of devils⁵. Or do we provoke the Lord to jealousy? are we stronger than he?⁶ (1 Cor. 10¹⁶⁻²²)

It will be noticed that in the quotation of this passage six words have been italicized, the word 'communion' four times and the word 'partake' twice. The Revised Version here correctly distinguishes two different Greek words; but altogether three word-forms are used. In the first two instances 'communion' renders the noun *koinonia*.⁷ In the two later instances the same English word renders the adjective *koinonos*.⁸ The word 'partake' in verses 17 and 21 renders the verb *metechein*.⁹ Scholars no longer find any recognizable difference in meaning between the two Greek words in question. The utmost that can safely be said about St. Paul's use of the second word is that he seems to use it by preference to indicate 'partaking' of food. The verb is used four times in this way in 1 Corinthians, three of them in this

¹ participation in (RV margin)

² loaf (RV margin)

³ seeing that there is one bread, we, who are many, are one body (RV margin)

⁴ from (RV margin)

⁵ demons (RV margin)

⁶ cp. Deut. 32¹⁶⁻²¹

⁷ *κοινωνία* twice in v. 16

⁸ *κοινωνοί* (v. 18); *κοινωνούς* (v. 20)

⁹ *μετέχομεν* (v. 17), *μετέχειν* (v. 21)

chapter.¹ Thus it was the natural word for him to use in the sentence: 'we all partake of the one bread' (v. 17), and again in the phrase: 'partake of the Lord's table' (v. 21).

This passage forms part of a discussion about meats offered to idols (chs. 8, 10) which is interrupted by other issues in chapter 9. The Corinthian Christians were in a dilemma about their relations with the social life of their pagan neighbours. Meat which had been offered in sacrifice to the heathen gods was sold in the market-place; and many Christians saw no harm in buying it for their own use. Moreover some of them went to dine with their heathen neighbours and ate such food. Some, perhaps, went even further and joined in the sacrificial feasts at heathen temples. This last practice is definitely and sternly condemned by St. Paul. He believed the pagan gods to be actual demons. To sacrifice to them was to sacrifice to demons. To partake of a feast upon food offered to them in sacrifice was to have 'communion' with demons. The sacrificial feasts in the idol temples must be avoided altogether. Moreover, although the heathen gods were mere nonentities for Christians, they were not just nothing at all. Their 'claims' to rival the one true God were empty nonsense; but they had a certain malignant power.² The more scrupulous Christians were, therefore, right in principle; although their fear of demonic influences, present in sacrificial meats, might be exaggerated and superstitious. It is characteristic of St. Paul that he perceived a far more serious danger in the intellectual superiority of the emancipated Christians, who laughed at the fears of the scrupulous. For 'knowledge puffeth up, but love edifieth' (8²). It were better to give up eating meat altogether than to put a stumbling-block in the way of 'the brother for whom Christ died' (8⁷⁻¹³).

Customs about food were to be settled on principles of charity and mutual edification. Even Jews and pagans were not to be needlessly offended (10³¹⁻³³). The idol-feasts in the temples, however, were on an altogether different footing. The reason for this distinction is fundamental to the meaning of the passage under consideration (10¹⁶⁻²²). The first half of this chapter (10¹⁻¹⁴) shows that St. Paul saw in the situation at Corinth a definite danger of relapse into idolatry. For all their spiritual

¹ 9¹⁰, 10¹⁷, 21, 30; see further, Additional Note G, p. 448 below

² cp. 8¹⁻⁷ with 10¹⁸⁻²², and see Moffatt (M), pp. 101-113, 134-145

privileges and gifts, the more precocious Corinthian Christians were in danger of 'tempting the Lord', like the Israelites in the desert. They were under-estimating the moral dangers of a heathen social order. Now the core of these moral dangers lay in the worship of false gods. Once compromise there, and the whole Christian life was threatened. Accordingly St. Paul bans the idol-feasts in the temples, because *to take part in such a feast is to offer sacrifice to the idol-gods*. By eating the sacrificial food in the temple-feast a man publicly acknowledged the lordship of the demon-gods, whether he intended this or not. He was therefore implicated in the false worship and became a partaker with the demons. He entered into communion with them.

The whole argument against attending idol-feasts depended upon the truth of the statement italicized in the last paragraph. This statement is implicit in verses 19-21. It did not need to be made explicit, because it expresses a belief which was common to St. Paul and to his readers at Corinth. Indeed it would have been accepted at once as true by all St. Paul's contemporaries in that age. For us eating and drinking are physical necessities to which custom and human nature also give a certain social significance. But to the ancient world these physical actions had originally a religious significance, which was connected with sacrifice. A constant factor in ancient religion was animal-sacrifice, with which feasting was often connected.¹ The religious feast was sacrificial, because the food eaten had been offered in sacrifice. To eat such food was understood to mean that one had a share in the offering of the sacrifice. Finally, the feast was in some sense shared by the god with his worshippers. To eat such food was an act of worship. It implied recognition of the god and of his lordship.² It promoted fellowship with him in a common life. In verse 18 the Corinthians, among whom were probably Jewish Christians, are reminded that the truth of these ideas could be illustrated from the cultus of the Old Testament. There too 'they who eat the sacrifices are partakers of the altar'. They had their share in the sacrifices from which the food was taken. To eat such holy food meant that those who ate took part in the worship of Israel's God. To eat sacrificial food was to take part in the sacrifice.

¹ cp. Judges 9²⁷ and margin

² cp. 8^{5, 6}

Now in the religion of the Old Testament the passover occupied a unique position as the annual commemoration of Israel's redemption from Egypt. Each family group sacrificed a lamb or kid and then feasted upon the sacrifice. Our Lord's death on the Cross took place at passover-time, probably on the actual day of the passover sacrifice. In any case his last supper with his disciples on the previous night had paschal associations quite apart from the words which he used in instituting the rite of the new covenant. In the Epistle to the Corinthians which we are now considering St. Paul reminds his readers that 'our passover was sacrificed, even Christ. Therefore, let us keep festival' (5^{7,8}). The way in which this statement is introduced shows that its truth will be recognized and accepted at once by his readers. They know the story of the Exodus.¹ They also know the story of the new Exodus (15¹⁻⁴) and they received from St. Paul a full account of the institution of the Eucharist by our Lord on the night of his betrayal (11²³⁻²⁶). This information had been transmitted to them by their apostle as the tradition which he received from the original Christian community.

If they knew all this, as there is good ground for believing, they were in a position to appreciate rightly the significance of their own sacred meal, the Christian eucharist. It had its background in the religious cultus of their own age; and it had a special relationship to the sacrificial worship of the Old Testament, particularly the passover meal. Jesus, their Lord, was the true paschal lamb, who offered himself as a sacrificial victim upon the Cross. As such he became their passover food. The Eucharist is the Christian passover meal, at which Christ gives his own life to his people. The words of Jesus at the last supper introduced something new to which there was no true parallel either in Jewish or in Gentile beliefs. The passover meal did not imply that God became food or partook of food. Such ideas were wholly absent from current Judaism. Moreover, whatever significance may have belonged to the sacrificial meals of earlier ages, they did not, in the period with which we are concerned, imply the notion of feeding upon the life of the god. Thus, if there was a certain similarity between the Christian eucharist and the sacred meals of other religions, there were also great differences. St. Paul's argument in 1 Corinthians

¹ cp. 10¹⁻¹⁴, which presumes their familiarity with O.T. history

10¹⁶⁻²² depends upon both of these factors, upon the points of likeness and upon the points of difference.

The argument implies a certain analogy between the Eucharist and the idol-feasts which took place in the temples. St. Paul could speak, in one and the same sentence, about 'partaking' of 'the table of the Lord' and 'the table of demons' (v. 21). Both phrases indicated a sacred meal upon food previously offered in sacrifice. Moreover, both phrases meant the same thing as 'partaking of the altar' (v. 18). For according to contemporary ideas a 'table' used for a meal upon sacrificial food was itself an 'altar', that is, a place of sacrifice. Thus 'the table of the Lord' was an altar in a sense analogous to that in which 'the table of demons' was an altar; just as the Jewish altar of sacrifice, mentioned in verse 18, was a 'table', inasmuch as some parts of animals there sacrificed were set aside to be eaten.¹ In all of this, Christian worship is not contrasted with the cultus of other religions, but aligned with it. It is a fundamental presupposition of verses 18-22 that Christianity has much in common with other religions. Its unique characteristics are not to be sought in a spiritual approach to God which is the opposite of sacrificial cultus. For St. Paul here interprets Holy Communion by reference to the ideas implied in non-Christian sacrifices.

In fact one of the leading ideas in this passage is the idea that 'communion' involves sacrifice. The modern dissociation of food from the old ideas of religious sacrifice makes it difficult for many people to grasp this essential connexion of 'communion' with 'sacrifice'. For St. Paul and his contemporaries the two ideas are inseparable. For us the word 'communion' may suggest fellowship with God or man, in a meal or in a spiritual experience, without there being necessarily any thought of 'sacrifice'. For St. Paul and his fellow-Christians this would have been difficult, perhaps impossible. The disintegration of the ancient and biblical idea of sacrificial communion has been further accentuated by the modern use of the word 'sacrifice' in a purely ethical sense without thought of its original meaning. For the ancient world and for the biblical writers 'sacrifice' signified primarily religious acts and institutions connected with the ancient forms of religious cultus, such as those which formed

¹ In Mal. 17, ¹² the altar is called 'the table of the Lord'

part of the Mosaic Law. The ethical use of the word is, however, itself a product of Christianity and a significant testimony to the transformation effected by the Gospel in the sphere of religious language.

We see this transformation at work in the New Testament. A notable instance is to be found in the exhortation of St. Paul to the Romans (12^{1,2}), to which reference has been made in this work.¹ There, as we saw, a contrast is drawn between Christian sacrifices and those of the ancient cultus. The 'spiritual rite' of dedicated Christian lives has its source in the sacrifice of Christ. It is indeed in a profoundly important sense to be identified with the one perfect sacrifice which is its source and foundation. Just so far as 'self-sacrifice' as an ethical principle of life is dissociated from Christ's sacrifice and all that is signified by that sacrifice, to that extent it is ceasing to have its full Christian meaning. It is indeed beginning to acquire a different meaning, which may be relatively high, noble and valuable, but which is to that extent no longer Christian. For it is possible for a man to sacrifice himself nobly on behalf of ideals and causes which are other than those of Christ, or even in conflict with the Gospel of Christ. It follows that for Christians the ideal of self-sacrifice is not independent of Christ's sacrifice. For the distinctively Christian conception of life is one which draws its whole power, inspiration and efficacy from that sacrifice.

Now the Christian conception of life may be said to be summed up in the word *koinonia*. The life which we share in common in the Church is not primarily that of a human fellowship. Its distinctive character as manifested in human fellowship is wholly drawn from a divine source, and mediated to us in that fellowship through our joint-participation in Christ. 'Communion', as the word is used here by St. Paul (10¹⁶), means precisely this joint-participation in Christ. It follows that, if the Christian eucharist is not primarily a social meal embodying and illustrating the principle of human fellowship, neither is it primarily a solitary, individual act of communion between the Christian and his divine Redeemer. Personal communion of the soul with God is integral to the meaning of the Gospel. But it would not in itself require to be expressed or fulfilled in a sacramental meal. The Eucharist

¹ see above, pp. 19-21

has always been regarded as the chief Christian sacrament and the central rite of Christian worship. It holds this pre-eminent position precisely because, more than any other religious rite, it is the means through which the whole common life of the Church, as a participation in Christ, is corporately manifested in its full significance and actuality. The individual finds his highest privilege through participation in that which is common to all. Yet what he participates in at Holy Communion is not merely the life of the community, regarded as a human fellowship. He participates jointly with his fellow-communicants in the life of Christ, as that life is imparted to the Church.

Now the life of Christ is essentially sacrificial. That life in which we are joint-partakers is the life which was offered once for all upon Calvary. We have already seen that the note of sacrifice dominates this passage, inasmuch as the argument depends upon an analogy of the Eucharist with other sacrificial meals, especially those of idol-temples at Corinth. It is, perhaps, because this analogy is connected in St. Paul's mind with a warning against idolatry (v. 14) that he mentions first 'the cup of blessing which we bless'.¹ The phrase is Jewish and corresponds to Jewish custom; but the contrast indicated by the context is that between the wine of the Christian eucharist and the libations of wine which were prominent at the idol-feasts. The two are compared only to be contrasted. Pagans also shared in a cup of sacrifice, with which their sacred feast was consecrated. But there the similarity ended. Christian and pagan both became partakers in a cult-sacrifice through drinking from a 'cup of blessing'. But the pagan cup had first been poured in libation to the honour of a false god, whereas the cup from which the Christian drank was 'a partaking of the blood of the Christ' (v. 16).

There is a passage in the Epistle to the Philippians, which may throw light upon this comparison and contrast with the heathen libation of wine:

Yea, and if I am poured out as a drink-offering² upon the sacrifice and service of your faith, I joy, and rejoice with you all.

(Phil. 2¹⁷)

Three of the words used in this short sentence belong to the

¹ The traditional order of the rite is given in 1 Cor. 10:23-26

² RV margin

language of sacrificial cultus.¹ St. Paul here pictures the possibility of his own death in the near future as a consequence of his apostolic labours on behalf of the Philippian Church and the Gentile world.² His readers had, doubtless, in their pre-Christian days been familiar with the libations of wine which were poured out in honour of the gods. The apostle here likens his own death to such a sacrificial libation, accompanying the sacrifice of their faith which is offered by the Philippian Church, and enhancing its value. The two sacrifices blending in mutual enrichment are matter for mutual joy to be shared by the apostle and his converts. This is the climax of a great exposition of the common life (1²⁷⁻²⁸). It includes the reference to the *koinonia* of the Spirit (2¹) and the Christological hymn of 2⁵⁻¹¹.

Behind the libation of St. Paul's life-blood in 2¹⁷ lies a whole chain of thought in which the following points may be noted. At the beginning of chapter 2 language closely parallel with that of 2 Corinthians 13¹⁴ is employed.³ In Christ the Philippians have God's love because they share the Spirit. Let them banish strife and vainglory and seek that unity of mind and spirit (cp. 1²⁷) which is their true heritage. 'Have this attitude of mind in you which you also have in Christ Jesus' (2⁵). They are bidden to be what they are as members of Christ. They are to think not of self, but of the one Body. Their attitude of mind individually among themselves is to be the same as that which they have in Christ. For they belong to a sacrificial organism, the One Man. He exhibited once for all the life to which they are committed as his members. When he who was 'in the form of God' took 'the form of a slave' by his Incarnation, that involved on his part a sacrificial outpouring. He made of himself a sacrificial libation in which nothing was kept back. He was obedient to his Father 'unto death', and that too the most shameful of all deaths. But 'he that humbleth himself shall be exalted' (Luke 14¹¹). 'Wherefore also God highly exalted him, and gave unto him the name which is above every name.' So to Jesus as 'Lord' all creation shall render divine honours, because 'he poured out his soul unto death'.⁴ How different is this true

¹ σπένδομαι, θυσία, λειτουργία

² cp. the similar passage in Col. 1²⁴, and the repetition of σπένδομαι in 2 Tim. 4⁶

³ see above, pp. 66 ff

⁴ Phil. 2⁵⁻¹¹, Isa. 53¹²; see above, p. 168, n. 6

history from the nature myths of the pagan 'lords many',¹ to whom libations were offered in the Corinthian temples!

In the absence of the apostle, soon his final absence through death, the Philippians are to put away their grumbles and disputes. They are to take in hand the working out of their salvation as a community. For it is God who is working in them to bring about the true unity. They are to exhibit the true life of the Body; to show God's glory in a world of darkness. All this means sacrifice. For their 'faith working through love'² is the proper sacrifice of Christ's members. The apostle's approaching death will be added to their sacrifice, and will be a libation like his Lord's (2¹⁷, 7). The joint sacrifices of the apostle and the Philippian Church are mutually enhancing, but only because both draw their efficacy from the great libation of Christ's out-poured blood. The sacrificial outpouring of Christ's self-giving had its source in heaven, and was enacted in 'the form of a slave' on earth. It was consummated in a slave's death on the Cross; but what was there consummated is ever renewed in the sacrificial life of the Church. As the sufferings of the Christ were present in St. Paul's body in prison,³ so the outpouring of blood in 'the form of a slave' was to be renewed in the libation of St. Paul's death. There was to be an overflow⁴ from the sacrificial death of the Lord Jesus Christ into the sacrificial death of the slave of Jesus Christ.

In the last chapter we saw that in the later Pauline epistles the Church is like a wine-cup into which the life of Christ flows. The mystical body is the fulness of Christ because it is like a chalice into which the precious blood of Christ is poured. The whole sacrifice of Christ is therefore present in the mystical body. It is not difficult to guess that the language of Colossians and Ephesians starts from eucharistic associations. Moreover it is a reasonable supposition that the whole Pauline doctrine of the Body of Christ is to be traced, in part, to the words: 'This is my body,' spoken by our Lord at the last supper.⁵ The probability that this is so is strengthened by the fact that the fullest statement of the doctrine of the Body (1 Cor. 12¹²⁻²⁷) follows

¹ 1 Cor. 8⁵

² Gal. 5⁶

³ Col. 1²⁴

⁴ 2 Cor. 1⁵

⁵ 1 Cor. 11²⁴, Mark 14²²; cp. A. E. J. Rawlinson, *The New Testament Doctrine of the Christ*, p. 157, n. 5, and J. Moffatt (M) on 1 Cor. 12, p. 184

immediately after the eucharistic expositions (chs. 10, 11). We must not, however, read back the more sharply articulated doctrine of the later epistles into 1 Corinthians. Here Christ is not the Head, but the Body (12¹²); this thesis is in perfect agreement with the teaching of the present passage (10^{16,17}).

We are partakers of Christ's body and blood. Elsewhere St. Paul teaches that we are redeemed by Christ's blood, and that in consequence of that redemptive blood-shedding we are grafted into him. Christ is the One Man in whom we are included, the One Body of which we are members. In baptism we were mystically united with his death and resurrection. The life which died and rose from the dead is now our life and is reproduced in us. What began in baptism is carried on continuously through the sacrament of the eucharist. The process which union by growth involves is the process of becoming 'united by growth' with the likeness of Christ's resurrection. Only thus shall we be conformed to the image of God's Son, so that our adoption at last corresponds to actuality. This is the process which is effected in us through the partaking of Christ's body and blood. In the passage which we are considering the mention of the blood first (whatever its reason) has the effect of heightening the sacrificial tone of the whole statement. By the universal symbolism of ancient religion blood shed in sacrifice was the life of the victim released from its natural function for a vicarious purpose. Its natural function was one of physical self-maintenance in the living animal. Its new vicarious function, when shed in sacrificial death, was to become a purifying, life-giving stream for the spiritual welfare of mankind. But the ritual acts performed with the blood presupposed the death of the victim, and therefore also the sacrificial offering of the body.

Body and blood, then, represent and fitly symbolize two different aspects of sacrifice,—namely the dedicated victim and the sacrificed life. Romans 12^{1,2} presents a picture of sacrifice which emphasizes the dedication of our bodies to God's service. Now, since in biblical thought the body represents the whole personality, this passage emphasizes the dedication of the whole man in the fulness of his human nature. Moreover, the body represents and may stand for the whole personality, and yet is not the whole but rather its embodiment; so the statement is

completed with a reference to the renewal of the mind or spirit (v. 2). In Colossians 1²⁴ we see another aspect of the dedicated body. In St. Paul's case his body in its physical sufferings was the instrument or organ through which the sufferings of Christ bore fruit in the Church, and so reached mankind as a whole. The dedicated body of a Christian is thus an organ or member of that sacrificial organism which is called the Body of Christ. But to complete the picture we must recall the fact that a sacrificial victim was dedicated to God in death, that its life might be released by blood-shedding. The picture in Philippians 2¹⁷ is the counterpart of the pictures in Romans 12^{1,2} and Colossians 1²⁴. The dedicated man is prepared, not only to suffer with Christ, but also to pour out his life-blood as a libation to the Father in union with the outpouring of Christ's blood unto death.

With this transformed doctrine of sacrifice in mind we are in a position to see how great a difference existed between the Christian eucharist and the other sacrificial feasts with which it is compared in 1 Corinthians 10¹⁶⁻²². Now at the heart of the contrast lies a characteristic feature to which in the idol-feasts there was apparently no exact parallel at all, even in a purely external sense. 'The loaf which we break is it not a partaking of the body of the Christ? Because we, the many, are one loaf, one body; for we all partake of the one loaf' (vv. 16, 17). 'The breaking of the bread' (loaf) was quite possibly the earliest name for the sacrament of the eucharist (cp. Acts 2⁴²). It looked back to our Lord's own practice.¹ Moreover, we have found reason for thinking that the statement in Acts 2⁴² was drawn up with careful precision. In that verse 'the breaking of the bread' followed next to 'the *koinonia*'. The two phrases are in close juxtaposition as they are in 1 Corinthians 10¹⁶. They are the two central phrases, flanked on the one side by 'the teaching of the apostles' and on the other by 'the prayers'. The leadership of 'the apostles' teaching' was destined eventually to draw the Church away from 'the prayers' of temple and synagogue into a distinctive order of worship. The heart of that worship from the beginning lay in 'the breaking of the bread'; and 'the breaking of the bread' was the central and characteristic action of 'the *koinonia*' as the Common Life of the Church.

¹ Mark 6⁴¹, 14²², Luke 24^{30, 35}

The central act of the life which Christians shared in common was a characteristic act of Jesus himself, which went back to the Galilean ministry. St. Paul's reference to the Eucharist in 1 Corinthians 10 is preceded by a warning against relapse into idolatry drawn from the story of Israel's Exodus out of Egypt to the promised land (10¹⁻¹⁴). The object of this section is to remind the Corinthians that it is possible to be admitted to high privileges and yet to fall from grace. The Israelites were fed with manna in their pilgrimage, as well as with water from the rock. Yet 'with most of them God was not well pleased: for they were overthrown in the wilderness'¹ (10³⁻⁵). St. Paul continues: 'These things happened as examples to warn us.' What had happened to Israel might happen to the Church of Corinth in its pilgrimage through the wilderness of a heathen world. Now the gospels tell us how Jesus 'broke bread' in a 'desert place'² or wilderness near the Lake of Galilee. With five loaves and two fishes he fed five thousand men. St. John (6⁴) records that this took place when 'the passover was at hand'. The time of year would explain the 'green grass' in such a place.³ But also the reference, here as in chapter 2¹³, points forward to another passover, when Jesus was crucified at the bidding of 'the Jews'. The crowd there present probably included some of those whom he had fed, as with manna, in the wilderness.⁴

The note of judgement which sounds through the record of Israel's apostasy in the wilderness (1 Cor. 10¹⁻¹⁴) is renewed by St. Paul again at the end of his second eucharistic exposition (11²⁶⁻³⁴). In these warnings the reference is eschatological, and inevitably so; for the whole atmosphere of Christian origins is eschatological. This is nowhere more evident than in 1 Corinthians. In chapter 7 the apostle had discouraged his readers from marrying on the ground that 'the time is shortened' (v. 29) and that 'the fashion of this world passeth away' (v. 31). So here he concludes the record of Israel's apostasy with the remark: 'Now these things happened to them by way of example; and they were written for our admonition, upon whom the ends of

¹ ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, quoted from Num. 14¹⁶; see next note, and cp. Heb. 3¹⁷

² ἔρημος (Mark 6³⁵ and parallels; but not John)

³ Mark 6³⁹; cp. John 6¹⁰

⁴ The feeding with manna in the wilderness (ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ) is mentioned by the Galileans in John 6³¹, and by Jesus in 6⁴⁹

the ages are come'¹ (10¹¹). If the Corinthians tempt the Lord by lusting after idol-feasts, or even by murmuring against the more scrupulous who will not share their laxity, they will suffer judgement as surely as those men whose carcasses strewed the wilderness. In chapter 11 the apostle carries the attack nearer home. It was bad enough to keep company with idol-worshippers in ways which scandalized their own brethren in Christ (ch. 8). For that was in effect to prefer the *koinonia* of demons to the *koinonia* of Christ, whether they actually became implicated in idol-sacrifices or not (10¹⁸⁻³³). In fact, however, the Corinthian Church was guilty of an even graver sin. For they were defiling the Lord's own meal with a spirit of profanity, a spirit which belonged rather to the *koinonia* of the demons than to that of Christ. Their gatherings for worship were marred by divisions and coteries. They no longer met as the One Body signified by the One Loaf (10¹⁷). If the One Loaf was still there, its very meaning was desecrated by the selfish greed of the participants. If superior people despised the scrupulous (ch. 8) that was not the worst. For apparently the central rite of the common life was made the occasion for the rich and leisured to trample upon the poor and humble and to deprive them of their part in the meal,—in effect an excommunication of the saints by the ungodly (11¹⁷⁻²²).

Now if the Church at Corinth observed the analogy of 'the last supper' the eucharistic rite proper did not begin until the meal had been some time in progress.² The common meal led up to its central feature, the breaking of the bread. This common meal was simply a counterpart of what took place in the upper room on the night of the betrayal. It had, and could have, no religious significance other than that of the upper room, whose common life it renewed. The whole purpose of the gathering, therefore, was to take part in the Lord's Supper as enacted by our Lord with his disciples. There, at a point in the meal which may have conformed to Jewish precedent or been suggested by Jewish custom,³ our Lord took a loaf and

¹ A better translation would be: 'for whom the ends of the ages overlap.' 'The present age' and 'the coming age' meet in the Church.

² Mark 14¹⁷⁻²², Luke 22^{14-18a}; on which, however, see Additional Note E, p. 354, below

³ Whether the custom belonged to the passover, to the '*kiddush*' or to the

blessed or gave thanks, and brake the bread. At the heart of the last supper was the Lord's Supper.¹ Now St. Paul does not accuse the Corinthians of having a number of Lord's suppers corresponding to the coteries which they had formed.² For he could still assume that they understood and accepted the principle of the 'one loaf'. In speaking of the contrast with the idol-feasts he had been able to select this point as one which was beyond controversy. As the Lord's Supper proceeded, the breaking of the bread began when the One Loaf was broken after thanksgiving in accordance with our Lord's act in the upper room. To partake of the One Loaf, thus 'blessed'³ and broken, was to partake jointly with the rest of the brethren in the Body of the Christ (10¹⁶). All this could be taken for granted. For he was appealing to sensible people who were able to judge the meaning of the accepted facts for themselves (10¹⁵).

But out of this arose a further point, which the apostle assumed to be equally self-evident when put to his readers. Which ever way we render the next verse (10¹⁷), the meaning is sufficiently clear. Our communion in the One Body of Christ continually recalls us to the fact that, although we are many in number, yet we, 'the many', are One Body. 'For we all partake of the one loaf.' Our unity in the Body is bound up with the fact that we all partake of that one loaf. For the Lord said: 'This is my body', identifying the loaf with his Body (11²⁴). We continue to be the one Body in virtue of the fact that we thus partake of Christ's Body. Indeed we can say that we are 'one loaf'; and probably this is what St. Paul meant. Speaking in the language of later distinctions this would mean that the One Loaf which is Christ's eucharistic body also signifies his mystical body. Now when St. Paul wrote 1 Corinthians he thought in terms of

'*ḥabûrah*' does not greatly matter. In any case our Lord was creating a new rite, for which there were no precedents.

¹ 1 Cor. 11²³, Mark 14²² (Luke 22¹⁹)

² Dr. Moffatt (M, *ad loc.*, p. 161) remarks that 'in the informal religious meals of Judaism, each guest might say the blessing over his own food'. Yet 'what Jesus left out is more significant than what he retained' and 'the original Lord's supper was a fresh religious formation, *associated with one loaf*' (*op. cit.*, pp. 165, 166, italics mine). This 'one loaf' is the whole point also of 1 Cor. 10¹⁷.

³ that is, hallowed by the thanksgiving addressed to God which was said over it.

One Body without distinctions. This one Body was nailed to the Cross and raised from the tomb. To it we belong as the limbs belong to a human body. It has always two aspects. For it is both the Christ and the Church, the Messiah and his people in the one organism of the New Israel. The unity of this One Body, however, wholly depends upon the fact that it is the Christ. We 'the many' find our unity only in him. Church-membership has no other significance than this. Thus, though we be called the Body of Christ (12²⁷), this continues to be true only because we are in him, and because we partake of him.

The eucharistic teaching of 1 Corinthians perfectly reflects the doctrine of the one organism, which in this group of epistles is sometimes called 'the Body of Christ', sometimes simply 'Christ' or 'the One Man Jesus Christ'. It reflects the two aspects of that one organism (*Messiah* and *ecclesia*, One and Many). We are the Body, because we are 'in Christ' and because we partake of him. That of which we partake is his sacrifice, that is, his death and his sacrificial life. For the efficacy of his death is in the sacrificial life which the risen Lord bestows upon us. Now whereas that sacrificial life was imparted to each of us individually in baptism, and is imparted to all of us in communion, there is a difference between the two sacraments. For by baptism each of us was admitted into the unity of the Body, whereas the Eucharist is the normal manifestation of that unity of the Body. It is that unity in its characteristic function. That characteristic function is the action of the One Man Jesus Christ in his Church. It is the manifestation on earth of 'the Man from heaven' (15⁴⁷), who is the divine-human organism of our salvation. He came from heaven to be our sacrifice ('our passover'); and in the Holy Eucharist heaven and earth are united in the action of that sacrifice. The congregation are gathered round the sacrifice to participate in it. By partaking of the One Loaf they become what the eucharistic bread signifies, namely the firstfruits of earth offered in heaven, the true oblation of man dedicated to the Creator of heaven and earth.

In another connexion it is written in this epistle: 'Each in his own order: Christ the firstfruits; then they that are Christ's at his coming' (15²³). This sentence has two aspects, the one positive and the other negative. (1) In its positive aspect Christ is the firstfruits of this earth and of the human race already

garnered in heaven; so he is always the present treasure which fills his Church. For in him heaven and earth are joined in one, so that the full granary of heaven is also present in the Church on earth. Because Christ the firstfruits is risen and ascended, therefore the Church is already the fulness of Christ.¹ This, which is always true in essence, is also specifically and sacramentally true in the Eucharist, when Christ identifies his present sacrificial life with the sacramental gifts of bread and wine. Thus, because he is already the firstfruits, we by partaking of him become the firstfruits in him. This is one application of the truth that 'he became what we are, that he might perfect us to be what he is'. 'For we, the many, are one loaf, one body; for we all partake of the one loaf.' Thus every Eucharist is an anticipation (foretaste) of the messianic banquet in heaven, as truly as every baptism anticipates the dawn of that day of regeneration when the Son of Man shall sit upon the throne of his glory.²

(2) There is, however, a negative aspect also to the statement in 1 Corinthians 15²³. The messianic banquet is not yet here, because Christ has not yet come in his final glory. From this point of view every Eucharist is a miracle of feeding in the wilderness like that wherein the Lord fed the five thousand Galileans. It is a provision of manna for those who have not yet reached the promised land. The divine provision is graciously made for a race of sinners who are all unworthy to receive it. So St. Paul found it to be at Corinth. He found a state of things which he could not praise (11¹⁷). The story of Israel in the wilderness was repeating itself. With many, perhaps most, of the Corinthian Christians God could not be well-pleased (10⁵). In fact the parallel went further. The Israelites ate and drank 'spiritual' food, that is food bestowed by God, and therefore filled with spiritual significance and power. In the case of the water, it flowed from a 'spiritual' rock which 'was the Christ' (10⁴).³ As the manna was 'spiritual' food so was

¹ see Chapters IX and X

² see Chapter VII

³ W. L. Knox, in *St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles* (pp. 87-89, 122-124), gives reasons for thinking that St. Paul here (as in 2¹⁶) identifies our Lord with the eternal Wisdom of God, because in current thought Jewish exegesis identified the water from the rock with Wisdom. So in Eccles. 15³ it is said of the man who communes with Wisdom: 'With bread of understanding

the eucharistic bread; for like the manna it came from heaven (cp. John 6³²). Moreover, as the rock from which the desert water flowed 'was the Christ', so also our Lord said of the eucharistic bread: 'This is my body' (11²⁴).¹ Again, as the Israelites who received this spiritual food had fallen into idolatry, immorality and rebellion against God, so the Corinthians were in danger of idolatry and had shown contempt for the common life of the One Body and for the sacrament of its unity. The wilderness of this world was not yet strewn with their corpses. But as Israel had been bitten with serpents (10⁹), so some of the Corinthians 'are weak and sickly, and not a few sleep' (11³⁰). This was the consequence of their sacrilegious attitude to the Body of Christ.

The sinful conduct of the Corinthians did not consist in having a separate supper for each clique or faction. This, it has been pointed out, is an impossible explanation, inasmuch as St. Paul could still assume the central significance of the One Loaf.² Their sinful conduct occurred, or at least began, during that part of the supper which was not strictly eucharistic, in the sense that the breaking of the one loaf of bread with thanksgiving and remembrance of our Lord's death had not yet taken place. Their first sin consisted in not waiting for late-comers, manual workers, for example, or slaves who were kept at work (cp. 11³³). Secondly they started supper at a time which suited

shall she feed him, and give him water of wisdom to drink'; and in Prov. 9¹⁻⁶ Wisdom furnishes a table with bread and wine and sends out invitations to the feast. This passage appears to be the background of our Lord's parable of the Great Supper (Luke 14¹⁵⁻²⁴). It is to be noticed (1) that this parable was our Lord's reply to a remark about the messianic banquet (v. 15); and (2) that whereas the remark referred to the blessedness of him 'that shall eat bread in the kingdom of God' the parable emphasized two points: (a) the unworthiness, indifference, and rejection of those first called; (b) the lowly and outcast state of those who replaced them. The whole is a fitting commentary on the situation at Corinth, where the rich were elbowing the poor out of the Christian foretaste of the messianic banquet!

¹ On 1 Cor. 10⁴ see further RP (ICC), *ad loc.*, p. 201. They quote Wisd. 11⁴, and remark (on 'the rock was the Christ'). 'there was a real Presence of Christ in the element which revived their bodies and strengthened their faith.' On the eucharistic significance of 'the rock' see also E. G. Selwyn, *The First Book of the Irenicum of John Forbes* (Cambridge, 1923), Appendix II: *eucharistic symbolism and adoration*, esp. pp. 221-223.

² see above, pp. 334 ff

their own 'set', presumably the well-to-do, and thus turned it into a merely social festivity instead of a religious act of the Church. What they came together for was not *the Lord's* supper, but their own supper.¹ This did not mean, however, that they did not intend to have the Breaking of the Bread. What St. Paul means is that, whatever their professed intention, their outward behaviour bore witness to their real, if unconscious, purpose. In holding a meal with his disciples on the night of his betrayal our Lord's purpose was in accordance with the whole of the mysterious events which were about to take place. He went to the upper room with them to prepare them for the Passion, but above all to institute the new covenant in his death with the words and acts of his own new rite. The Lord's Supper in the primitive Christian communities was the solemn re-enactment, as far as might be, of what was there done and said. By disregarding the needs of others and by their particularism, quite as much as by their greed and drunkenness, the Corinthians showed that their main interest on these occasions did not lie in the memorial feast of the upper room, but rather in themselves and their own affairs. What they were doing might just as well be done at home in their own houses. For their own houses were the proper places for that kind of thing. Although outwardly they came together to 'the same place',² the spirit of the common life in its twofold meaning was wholly absent from such gatherings.

Now the One Loaf which was eventually 'blessed'³ and broken at this secularized supper signified everything which they had violated and forgotten. It signified the One Body to which the defrauded, poorer brethren belonged equally with the rest. But further, rich and poor alike belonged to that One Body because Christ had died for all upon the Cross, because he had suffered his body to be pierced and his blood to be poured out unto death. The One Cup also signified the One Life sacrificed for many, that the many might become one.⁴ This eucharistic

¹ literally 'their own', in the sense that these people brought their own provisions and did not wait to share them

² ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ, as on the first Whitsunday (Acts 2¹) where 'the house' of v. 2 suggests the familiar 'upper room'

³ see above, p. 335, n. 3

⁴ For 'the many' of 10¹⁷, cp. the references in the note on pp. 309, 310

cup was 'blessed' and received at the end of the common meal, in accordance with the Pauline tradition of the Lord's Supper (11²⁵).¹ The cup of the Lord's sacrificial blood was, therefore, drunk by a congregation, some of whom had already had too much to drink, while the late-comers were still hungry and thirsty. One of the worst features of this sacrilegious meal has still to be mentioned. In chapter 12^{28, 29}, in his description of the Church as the Body of Christ, St. Paul expressly mentions that God has set 'in the church', not only apostles and prophets but also local officers, such as 'teachers' and the settled organization which is suggested by 'governments'.² The Corinthian Church, in St. Paul's absence, was not leaderless. It had a local ministry. When the One Loaf was blessed under such scandalous circumstances one of these local presbyters must have presided, overawed perhaps by influential members of the company. 'Company' indeed is the right word; for they were no longer a congregation, except in name.

Such an officer of the local Church would perform the ritual acts which were performed by our Lord at the first Eucharist, and would use Christ's own words as treasured in the tradition handed over by St. Paul (11²³⁻²⁵). Yet, as the agent (whether willing or not) of a Church behaving as the Corinthian Church was behaving, he was more truly representative of Judas at the last supper than of Christ. 'The Lord Jesus, on the night on

¹ μετὰ τὸ δευπνῆσαι

² κυβερνήσεις. MM show (on p. 363¹) from an inscription (given on p. 41¹) that this word 'is applied to the management of a household'; they compare 1 Cor. 12²⁸. Now in a well-ordered household someone with recognized authority normally presides at meals. So also RP point out (ICC, p. 256) that 'we may assume from τοῦτο ποιεῖτε that the Christian Supper was closely modelled, in all essentials, on what Christ did at the Paschal Supper.' Further they recognize that 'this carries with it . . . The Blessing and Breaking of Bread and the Blessing of a Cup, *as then by Christ, so later by a presiding person*' (italics mine). Unfortunately RP miss the significance of this admission because they have already taken over from another writer a fatal confusion between the meal as a whole and the ritual acts which our Lord inserted into it. An act of Christ, which the Church understood to be sacrificial, because 'covenant' means 'sacrifice' (cp. 11²⁵ and the analogy with sacrificial feasts in ch. 10), would be performed by someone who was not only 'presiding', but who actually at that moment stood to the congregation *in loco Christi*. He was in charge of 'the household of God'. In other words, he was a recognized officer of the Church in Corinth.

which he was being delivered up,¹ took bread' (1 I 23). The word which the Revised Version here renders: 'was betrayed' is in the imperfect tense. It was the night on which the plot against our Lord was already in full train. Judas had made his plans; and they were already being carried into effect. Whilst Judas ate and drank with Jesus the sacred meal of the new covenant,² his fellow-conspirators amongst the Jewish rulers were perfecting their arrangements for the treacherous act in the garden of Gethsemane. Belonging as he did to the Body which, in the person of its Head, was even then proclaiming 'the Lord's death' a sacrifice for sin, Judas, the offending member,³ was already 'guilty of the body and the blood of the Lord' (1 I 26, 27). The part thus played by Judas was being enacted again at Corinth as in the wilderness during the Exodus, when on one occasion even Aaron took the part of chief traitor.⁴

Now the word used to signify the treacherous action of Judas in 'betraying' Christ is also used by St. Paul here (1 I 23) and in 15³ to signify his own faithful stewardship in 'handing over' the 'traditions' of the Church concerning the Eucharist and the facts of our redemption through Christ. What the apostle, acting as Christ's true representative, had 'delivered'⁵ to the Corinthian Church, the presbyters of that Church, playing the part of Judas, had 'betrayed'. They were 'delivering' up Christ to be crucified afresh. They and their fellow-Christians at Corinth were 'putting him to an open shame'.⁶ These grave words of another New Testament writer bring out, for English readers, the significance of St. Paul's challenging question: 'Do ye despise the church of God, and put them to shame that have not?' (1 I 22). They were betraying the trust committed to them by the apostle. As traitors to Christ and to his Church they were also traitors to the common life. For 'inasmuch as ye did it not unto one of these least, ye did it not unto me'.⁷ The Body of Christ has two aspects, the *Messiah* and the *ecclesia*, the One and the Many. In shaming the humblest of 'the many' they were sham-

¹ *παρεδίδετο*. See also Mark 14^{10, 18, 21}, Luke 22^{3-6, 21, 22}.

² or at least the earlier part of the meal; according to Bernard (pp. clxxiii, 457) the Institution occurred after John 13³⁰

³ cp. Matt. 18⁷⁻⁹

⁴ Exod. 32¹⁻⁶; cp. 1 Cor. 10⁷

⁵ *παρέδωκα* in both passages

⁶ Heb. 6⁶

⁷ Matt. 25⁴⁵

ing 'the One', 'not discerning the body' (11²⁹): 'seeing that we, the many, are one loaf, one body; for we all partake of the one loaf' (10¹⁷). To 'discern' the Body rightly would be to discern also the common life in the Body of Christ, that is to say, nothing less than the significance of the Gospel in and for the Church. In these words about 'discerning the body' we see one of St. Paul's greatest contributions to religion. They are the counterpart of the remark that we are one loaf, because we all partake of the One Loaf.

For we are held together in a unity solely through the sacrificial life of Christ. We are the extension of his sacrificial organism; we are the camp of Israel surrounding the tabernacle.¹ The glory of the Shekinah casts its rays over us, reaching to every corner, even to the outermost lines and to the humblest tents. The 'glory' of Christ's sacrifice² is the centre of the sanctuary. The Lamb slain and enthroned, both in heaven and on earth, is the focus of the Church's worship. And as heaven and earth are united in him, so also are God and man. In the Apocalypse identical honour is paid to 'God and the Lamb' (Rev. 5^{13,14}). They share one throne (22¹). They constitute one sanctuary in the New Jerusalem (21²²). The holy city is illuminated by the glory of God, and 'the lamp thereof is the Lamb' (21²³). The sacrificial victim of the Christian passover, triumphant over death, is here the lamp whose flame is the glory of God. Perhaps the same idea is present in 21¹¹ which refers to the holy city 'having the glory of God'. The verse proceeds: 'her luminary³ was like unto a stone most precious, as it were a jasper stone, clear as crystal.' The sacrificed, yet victorious, life of Christ is the lamp which glows with the glory of the Shekinah. For Christ's sacrificed Body is the meeting place of God and man, where the redeemed share with the eye-witnesses the privilege of beholding 'the glory as of an only Son from a Father full of grace and truth'. We are within the sanctuary; for we are the camp of Israel where God dwells and walks. Yet we are also orientated towards the sanctuary, that inner sanctuary of the holy city which is identified with God

¹ see above, p. 315, and cp. Rev. 21³

² in the Johannine sense; cp. Chapter VIII, pp. 249 ff, above

³ RV margin; *φωστήρ* is also the word used in Phil. 2¹⁵ to describe Christians as lamp-like stars, lighting up a dark world; cp. p. 330 above

and the Lamb. We are members of the Body, being in Christ. Yet we also partake of the Body of the divine-human victim; that he may dwell in us, as we in him.

The Corinthian Christians were partakers of the eucharistic food. They ate 'this bread' and drank 'the cup of the Lord'. But some of them did so 'unworthily' to their judgement, 'not discerning the body' (1 Cor. 11²⁶⁻²⁹). For such their acts of communion *were* their judgement (v. 29). The testing process which brings self-knowledge (v. 28) was absent; and so they had never come to an understanding concerning the spiritual mysteries in which they were partakers. Their behaviour towards their fellow-Christians and their unseemly conduct at the sacred meal were both alike outward manifestations of their failure in spiritual insight. They did not yet realize the sacrificial significance of Christ's Body in its implications for their own lives. For to discern the Body is to perceive the glory of Christ's sacrifice. It is to recognize that his life which we receive is sacrificial, and that in receiving it we also become sacrificial. It is to recognize the joy of self-giving to others in the One Body, even as Christ gave himself up for us and to us. To be partakers in Christ's sacrificial action in the Holy Eucharist is a joyful solemnity whose counterpart is equally joyful, namely, to be ourselves the organs of that sacrificial action towards the brethren in Christ. These two are, so to speak, the concave and the convex of the same figure, the inward and the outward aspects of the same sacrificial life.

To discern the Body then is to recognize the true pattern of the common life and our relation to it. Moses prefigured that pattern in 'accounting the reproach of the Christ greater riches than the treasures of Egypt', when 'he looked unto the recompense of reward'. Unconsciously he looked, as we with full discernment are to look, 'unto Jesus the author and perfecter of our faith'; seeing that Jesus is the exemplar of the common life for us, 'who for the joy that was set before him endured the cross, despising shame, and hath sat down at the right hand of the throne of God.'¹ Like Moses we are to look unto Jesus, seeing in his 'reproach' our supreme treasure. Like Moses also we are to find that treasure of 'reproach' in the needs and distresses of Christ's people. Instead of 'despising the church of God' and

¹ Heb. 11²⁶, 12²; see above, pp. 29, 30, 36

putting 'them to shame that have not',¹ we are to despise 'the shame' of the Cross² and to find in it the peculiar treasure of Christ's Body. For it is only as we are orientated towards the inner sanctuary of Christ's sacrifice that we can 'discern' the Body wherever the rays of the Shekinah's glory fall, even in the uttermost parts of the camp. 'Discerning the body' and 'looking unto Jesus' are inseparable, as two aspects of the same disposition. This is signified, again, in the language of the Apocalypse about the Lamb being the 'lamp' or 'luminary' of the holy city.

What follows that picture is equally significant. In Revelation 22¹⁻⁵ the metaphors of refreshment and light are combined. The paschal Lamb enthroned with God is the lamp whose flame is God's glory. Out of sacrificial love enthroned in uncreated light flows the river of the Spirit, which in turn waters the tree of life bearing twelve kinds of fruits.³ We have already noticed this combination of metaphors in the Psalms in another connexion.⁴ The words of Psalm 34⁸: 'O taste and see that the Lord is good,' are quoted to the new-born Christians of 1 Peter.⁵ The same imagery is employed by the writer to the Hebrews in the description of 'those who were once enlightened and tasted the heavenly gift'⁶, where the reference to baptism, confirmation and first communion is sufficiently clear. A similar combination of ideas runs through the fourth gospel. So in 1 Corinthians we may find a significant connexion between three texts: 2¹⁶, 10⁴ and 11²⁹. The first and second of these passages appear to identify our Lord with the eternal Wisdom of God.⁷ We are admitted to a share in the thoughts of Christ crucified, who as the Wisdom of God is the Creator of the universe (2¹⁶). The same divine Lord, in his rôle as Wisdom, gives us spiritual food and drink (10⁴); and it is *the bread of understanding* which Wisdom bestows.⁸ To partake rightly of Holy Communion is to have the eyes opened to understand the glory of Christ crucified. It is to share his thoughts about his sacrifice,

¹ 1 Cor. 11²²

² Heb. 12³

³ cp. 21⁶, 22¹⁷. The whole of Rev. 21, 22 has close affinities with St. John's Gospel. In 22⁴ the climax is reached. Access to the water of life and the tree of life in 'Paradise regained' is associated with the vision of God.

⁴ Ps. 34, 36; see above, p. 104 and n. 2

⁵ 21³; see above, pp. 202

⁶ 64; cp. above, p. 233 and n. 4

⁷ see above, p. 337, n. 3, and in Chapter IV, pp. 111, 112

⁸ Eccles. 15³

and therefore to discern the Body (11²⁹). As 'grace' is before 'truth' in the Johannine conception of the fulness which we receive,¹ so for St. Paul mystical union with Christ in the sacraments is the way into the secrets of the sanctuary, that sanctuary which is Christ's Body. Now the Body which is a sanctuary is also a sacrifice. It is the divine-human *locus* of God's sacrificial presence, just because it is the sacrificial heart of the new world which he has made in Christ. But the place of sacrifice has two centres of reference corresponding to the two aspects of Christ's Body. The specific presence which we associate with the eucharistic altar of sacrifice has its counterpart in the common life of brotherly love. The eucharistic body is identified with that Bread which also signifies the mystical body.² There can be no true discernment of 'the body' which does not include both.

For the essence of the eucharistic rite is a proclamation of the Lord's death as his 'memorial' 'till he come' (11²⁴⁻²⁶). It looks back to the death and resurrection and forward to the final Coming. It spans the whole of the Christian dispensation, and therefore all creation too,³ in its exaltation of Christ's redeeming love before God and man. It is the mystically re-enacted drama of that redemption which embodied in history the Son's sacrificial response to the Father. We who are 'in Christ', as members of his Body, are caught up into that embodied response of love which we proclaim. His response has its source in heaven; for he is 'the Man from heaven'. In his redemptive act that filial response returned again to heaven, to the bosom of the Father to which it always belonged, and in which it was always present.⁴ For St. Paul, however, his doctrine of the firstfruits (15²³) dominates the present situation. Though we are 'in Christ', we are still in this mortal body.⁵ Our eucharistic communion with God and man lies between the two Comings of 'the Man from heaven'. So, like our Lord in his mortal body, we are 'straitened'⁶ until our passion is accomplished. The foretaste of the messianic banquet induces a longing for the final

¹ John 1¹⁴, 16

² The One Loaf is identified with the One Man and signifies 'the many' in 'the One'; cp. above, pp. 335, 336.

³ see further below, pp. 358-361

⁴ cp. John 1¹⁸

⁵ Rom. 8¹⁰, 11

⁶ Luke 12⁵⁰: *συνέχουμαι*

reality of unclouded vision.¹ In another connexion St. Paul could say:

But I am in a strait² betwixt the two, having the desire to depart and be with Christ; for it is very far better: yet to abide in the flesh is more needful for your sake. (Phil. 1²³, 24)

This longing of the apostle to leave 'the flesh' of the mortal body and be 'with Christ' (cp. Phil. 2¹⁷, 3^{11π}) is another form of that eschatological tension which belongs to every Eucharist.³ It is expressed in the words of 1 Corinthians: 'till he come' (11²⁶), and again at the end of the same epistle in the primitive cry: 'Maranatha',—'Come, our Lord!'⁴ Because the dawn is already here, a door has been opened in heaven. We have a glimpse of joys to come and therefore 'groan within ourselves, waiting for our adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body'.⁵

The word rendered: 'I am in a strait' in Philippians 1²³ is the word used by St. Luke in reporting our Lord's cry: 'how am I straitened!' (12⁵⁰), in reference to the baptism of blood which he had to accomplish. This parallel between the apostle and his Lord re-appears in a parallel between St. Paul's account of the Eucharist and the synoptic accounts of the last supper. Just as every Eucharist looks forward to the Lord's Coming, so the Lord himself on the night of his betrayal looked forward to the new wine of the kingdom of God. The words in which this anticipation is expressed occur in all three synoptic gospels. Two of the three place them immediately after the blessing and distribution of the eucharistic cup. This has the double effect of emphasizing the imminence of our Lord's death and of connecting the eucharistic chalice with the messianic banquet. The words in St. Mark's Gospel read as follows:

Verily I say unto you, I will no more drink of the fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new in the kingdom of God.
(Mark 14²⁵)

¹ cp. 1 Pet. 1³⁻¹³; on which see above, p. 198 ² *συνέχομαι*

³ It is not, however, suggested that this connexion of thought is explicitly Pauline.

⁴ or possibly: 'Our Lord is coming.' See Moffatt (M), pp. 282-286, on 1 Cor. 16²²; cp. the words of the antiphon for the office of Compline, as sung at Mirfield every night in Advent: 'Come, O Lord: and visit us in peace; that we may joy before thee with a perfect heart.'

⁵ Rom. 8²³, on which see the concluding pages of Chapter VI

In St. Luke's Gospel the saying appears to be connected with an earlier cup.¹ But in any case here also there is the same sense of crisis. Death is imminent; and its issue occupies our Lord's thoughts. In St. Luke's Gospel, however, this situation is expressed in a manner peculiar to the evangelist.

Now the idea that the last supper was the passover had acquired a firm hold in primitive Christian tradition before the gospels were written. And so, of course, it was (in a mystical, Christian sense), seeing that Christ is our paschal Lamb (1 Cor. 5⁸). So the three synoptists agree in suggesting that a passover meal was arranged. However we explain this peculiarity of their narratives it is equally prominent in them all. St. Luke differs only in omitting a discrepant note,² which was clearly inconsistent with the situation envisaged. None of the three, however, mention a passover lamb; and St. Luke makes the reason explicit. 'When the hour was come'³ it at once became clear that this was not to be a 'passover' meal in the usual meaning of the word. The disciples have now become 'the apostles' (22¹⁴); and Jesus explains: 'I desired earnestly to eat this passover with you before I suffer; for I say unto you that *I shall not eat it*⁴ until it is fulfilled in the kingdom of God' (vv. 15, 16). There is to be no Jewish passover meal for Jesus. He is to die before it can take place. His Jewish piety towards the feast of the national redemption is to be disappointed. Presently he will explain that this deprivation is due to the treachery of Judas. He knows that he is to die before the feast; but he looks forward to the fulfilment of its true significance, on the other side of death, 'in the kingdom of God'. There follows a farewell meal on the model of current Jewish practices.⁵ It is now evident that all the elaborate pre-

¹ Luke 22^{17, 18}. But this depends upon the view taken of the Lucan narrative as a whole; e.g. J. M. Creed held that the cup in question was eucharistic (*The Gospel according to St. Luke*, pp. 261, 262). See further, Additional Note E, p. 354 below.

² Mark 14² = Matt. 26⁵

³ The phrase is peculiar to St. Luke (22¹⁴)

⁴ οὐ μὴ φάγω—an emphatic negation

⁵ The cup before the bread might suggest a form of *kiddush*; and the saying about 'the fruit of the vine' might follow naturally on the blessing of the *kiddush* cup, which contained this very phrase. The form is given by F. C. N. Hicks in *The Fulness of Sacrifice*, p. 216; and more fully by

parations for 'the passover' were really preparations for the Christian passover. Whether St. Luke intended to record the actual institution of the Eucharist, or to omit it, the uncertainties about the text of this passage make it impossible for us to say.¹

If we follow the shorter text of St. Luke the sequence of his story in the upper room follows a course not unlike that of John 13^{ff}. The references to the future 'kingdom of God' in the former are paralleled by the allusions to 'going to God' in the latter.² The talk at supper is of our Lord's coming departure from this world. Moreover, in both the tragic note is deepened by references to the traitor. In both there is discourse about lowly service.³ Again, the double theme of coming glory for those who have shared Christ's trials is expanded in the long Johannine discourse.⁴ The reference to sharing Christ's kingdom has its counterpart in the saying: 'In the world ye have tribulation: but be of good cheer; I have overcome the world' (John 16³³). It is evident that these two evangelists are confidently following lines of tradition which they have good reason to trust, and which have much in common.⁵ There is a contrast drawn between present tribulation under the shadow of death and a future glory which lies beyond death. But the same general pattern is present in the story of St. Mark, notwithstanding all the differences. For there too the passion narrative opens with a solemn announcement of the coming death (14⁸).⁶ As in John 13, this is accompanied by references to the traitor and followed by the distressful questioning which the direct intimation ('one of you') elicits (Mark 14¹⁸⁻²¹). The certainty of coming death is intensified by the eucharistic institution. But this concludes with a triumphant reference to 'that day when

W. O. E. Oesterley in *The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy*, p. 81. There are, however, weighty reasons for regarding the last supper as a religious fellowship-meal following the Jewish *habûrah* model; see *The Early Eucharist* by F. L. Cirlot.

¹ see Additional Note E, p. 354

² John 13¹⁻³, 14^{12, 28}, 16^{5, 10, 28}

³ cp. Luke 22²⁴⁻²⁷ with John 13¹²⁻¹⁷

⁴ cp. Luke 22²⁸⁻³⁰ with John 15¹¹⁻¹⁶, 16²⁰⁻²²

⁵ The same general agreement re-appears in the parallel Easter stories (Luke 24 and John 20)

⁶ Mark 14¹⁻¹⁷ has significant correspondences and contrasts, not only with John 12¹⁻¹¹, but also with John 13¹⁻²⁰; cp. above, pp. 229 *ff*

I drink it new in the kingdom of God' (14²⁵); the saying conveys a note of joyful certainty which is not reproduced in the Lucan parallel: 'until the kingdom of God come' (22¹⁸). The conclusion of Mark 14²⁵, however, is fully represented by St. Luke's extended statement concerning the coming messianic banquet (22^{29,30}). Both occur (like John 16³³) towards the end of the 'supper' narrative. St. Matthew's version of the saying in Mark 14²⁵ brings it a stage nearer to the picture drawn in Luke 22^{29,30} by introducing the words 'with you' (26²⁹). This is probably a correct editing of Mark, like the corresponding addition of 'unto remission of sins' in the preceding verse (26²⁸).

Jesus looks beyond the crisis of death to a future messianic glory, when he will be the host at a banquet shared by his disciples. The words spoken in the upper room were an initiation of the disciples into suffering and death; but also into the glory which follows the resurrection. So as they go out into the night, in St. Mark's story, Jesus quotes the prophecy of Zechariah: 'I will smite the shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered'; but he adds the triumphant words: 'After I am risen, I will go before you into Galilee.' The note of coming triumph cannot be silenced. This is true of all four narratives. The Day of the Lord casts its beams of radiance back into the upper room. This is also implied in St. Mark's account of the Institution as well as in St. Paul's. For a new covenant is instituted. This is not the end, but a new beginning. A new dispensation is being inaugurated. As the covenant of Moses was the prelude to the promised land, still more the covenant of Jesus. This is also indicated in the allusion to the triumph of the suffering Servant, suggested by the phrase 'poured out for many'.¹ So too in the great discourse the sorrow 'now' is fully recognized. But it is not the last word; for 'I will see you again, and your heart shall rejoice, and your joy no one taketh from you' (John 16²²). The eschatological crisis was sharp and poignant. Yet it was and is more blessed to be within the crisis than to fall outside it. To 'proclaim the Lord's death until he come' is a perpetual re-affirmation of this truth in act; every Eucharist is a renewal of our initiation into the sacrifice of Christ, with its pattern of suffering and glory.

¹ Mark 14²⁴, Matt. 26²⁸; cp. Isa. 53¹¹ (many) and 53¹² (poured out)

It is impossible to reproduce in English the fact that 'crisis' and 'judgement' are the same word in Greek.¹ Similarly in 1 Corinthians 11^{29, 31} the same word is used for 'discerning' the Body and 'testing' or 'examining' ourselves with a view to self-knowledge. This word also belongs to the same root as the words for 'judging', 'judgement' and 'condemnation'.² St. Paul expects from the Christian man acts of spiritual discernment which involve passing 'critical' judgement upon himself and according justice to his fellow-Christians. Of such judgements the 'natural' man is incapable. But we share the thoughts of Christ crucified and are fed by him with 'the bread of understanding'. So the eucharistic life involves repeated acts of self-surrender, by which we place ourselves afresh within the sacrifice of Christ and judge all things from his standpoint. So far as we rightly pass judgement upon ourselves through this act of surrender, we pass unscathed through the crisis of judgement (11³¹). For we are within the crisis in the sense that we are within Christ's sacrificial life by which all things are tested. Thus the divine judgement, for us, takes the form of chastening (11³²)—the humbling process of repudiating our own proud thoughts and receiving in their place the lowly thoughts of Christ crucified. But it is more blessed to be thus chastened within than to be condemned with the world without (11³²).³ From all this there follows inevitably a sombre view of the figure of Judas in the upper room. When we contemplate that unhappy figure, we have to recall the fact that in all of us there is something of the traitor. We are Judas who betrayed, as well as Peter who denied. But by the mercy of God we are also 'the beloved disciple' who reclined on the breast of Jesus.

Now it is to be noticed that both St. Mark and St. John represent our Lord as applying to Judas the words of Psalm 41⁹:

Yea, mine own familiar friend, in whom I trusted, which did eat of my bread, hath lifted up his heel against me.

¹ More exactly 'crisis' comes from *κρίσις*, which can mean (1) 'judging', 'trial', (2) 'judgement', 'decision', and so = *κρίμα* (1 Cor. 11³⁴), i.e. a 'legal decision.' But in biblical Greek *κρίσις* can mean (3) the ethical act of passing judgement, and so coming to a just decision. For this MM quote Matt. 23²³, Luke 11⁴². In both M translates: 'justice.'

² Thus in 1 Cor. 11²⁹⁻³⁴ there occur successively *κρίμα*, *διακρίνων*, *διακρίνομεν*, *ἐκρινόμεθα*, *κρινόμενοι*, *κατακριθῶμεν*, *κρίμα*

³ cp. above, Chapter VIII, pp. 244, 245

St. Mark simply quotes from the Greek Bible the phrase: '*he that eateth* with me.' In St. John's Gospel there follows the incident of the 'sop' by which the traitor is identified;¹ by which, also, the psalm is fulfilled. The purpose of God is fulfilled in Judas. That is the point of our Lord's reference to the psalm; and of course here, as always, the emphasis falls, not first on 'treachery', but on the Servant of the Lord being 'delivered up' in fulfilment of Scripture.² In St. John the whole incident is told in a most striking fashion. Judas is identified by receiving the sop in fulfilment of Scripture; 'and after the sop, then entered Satan into him.'³ Only 'then' and not before; because by fulfilling the psalm Judas accepted the rôle of traitor in accordance with divine predestination. Then there follow the words of his dismissal, not understood by the rest; and Judas went out at once into the 'night' (John 13²⁷⁻³⁰). There are two other significant points in this narrative. The first is connected with 'the beloved disciple'. It is he to whom our Lord communicated the identity of the traitor with the words: 'that person for whom I shall dip the sop and give it to him.' To him, also, the writing of this story is attributed in 21²⁴. None but this narrator understood why Judas went out.⁴ There is a deliberate contrast here between the man who shared his Lord's secrets, the man who was truly 'mine own familiar friend, in whom I trusted', and the other man who went out into 'the night'. Both had the same outward fellowship with the incarnate Word. Yet the one reclined on the Lord's breast (cp. 1¹⁸), whilst the other became the abode of Satan.

Secondly the evangelist quotes Psalm 41⁹ (13¹⁸), giving an unusual rendering.⁵ For 'he that eateth' he uses a word which is said 'to connote eating of delicacies, or eating with enjoyment'.⁶ Elsewhere he uses this word only in 6⁵⁴⁻⁵⁸ (four times); which suggests that for him the word had eucharistic

¹ Mark and Matt. have: 'he that dippeth (dipped his hand) with me in the dish'. Only in Matt. and in John is the traitor explicitly identified.

² Isa. 53¹² (LXX); cp. above, p. 231

³ ἐκεῖνον (v. 27) 'that person', designated in the previous verse with his full title: 'Judas the son of Simon Iscariot' (v. 26)

⁴ οὐδείς (v. 28) cannot include the narrator unless the subsequent enlightenment expressly mentioned in 2²² and 12¹⁶ is here silently presumed.

⁵ of the Hebrew (41¹⁰); the first half of the verse is omitted, as unsuitable

⁶ Bernard, p. 210 (cp. p. 468). But see MM, p. 644

associations.¹ Judas enjoyed table-fellowship with our Lord, sharing part of this most sacred meal. Yet he had no share in the joys of spiritual intimacy. He did not 'discern the body'. His case was like that of the five thousand Galileans, who 'ate of the loaves and were filled' (6²⁶), but had no part in the mystical fellowship of Jesus. For, unlike St. Mark, St. John does not regard the feeding of the five thousand as a sacramental mystery. In place of 'the desert' with its 'green' oasis² he merely has the remark that 'there was much grass in the place' (v. 10). The solemn liturgical language about 'the breaking' of the loaves³ is replaced by a simple 'giving of thanks' (v. 11). This was not 'spiritual food',⁴ nor manna in the wilderness.⁵ The men saw 'the signs which he did'. But 'the prophet who cometh into the world' (v. 14) was to give them material benefits (vv. 2, 15, 26)! They saw; yet they saw not (vv. 26, 36),—like Judas.⁶

The discourse at Capernaum is deeply related to the Gospel as a whole. Psalm 41⁹ was fulfilled, not only by Judas, but also by apostate Israel,—'the Jews,' of whom the five thousand men were representative. Jesus tells them that the Mosaic Law is superseded by the one work of God, namely, to believe on him whom God sent (vv. 28, 29). The reply to this challenge demands 'a sign from heaven' like the manna. Our Lord points out that Moses did *not* give this sign. It came from the Father, who gives 'the genuine bread from heaven' (vv. 30–32). The next verse takes up the theme of earlier discourses⁷ already indicated in verse 27. The Son of Man gives 'the meat which abideth unto eternal life'. This is throughout *contrasted* with the manna (vv. 32, 49, 50, 58). The Son of Man came down from heaven (3^{13, 31}), and will return thither (6⁶²). He alone is 'the bread of God which comes down from heaven and gives life to the world' (v. 33). He is 'the living bread which came down from heaven'. He alone can give 'the life' which satisfies permanently and abides for ever (vv. 35, 51). There follows a

¹ coupled, however, with the sombre indications of the psalm

² Mark 6^{35, 39}

³ Every detail in Mark 6⁴¹ (except the fishes) became liturgical in the Christian Church.

⁴ 1 Cor. 10³

⁵ Contrast the use of *ἐρημος* twice later (vv. 31, 49)

⁶ cp. vv. 64, 70, 71

⁷ cp. vv. 33–35 with 3^{11–15}, 4^{10–15}

contrast between human 'sight' and 'faith', the spiritual vision which God alone can give (vv. 36-47). This section is to be compared with the question of Nicodemus: 'How can these things come about?' (3⁹), with the implications of the brazen serpent (3¹⁴) and with the main theme of the Son's glory summed up in chapter 12.¹

That glory is veiled from human sight. Only the Father can unveil it. Yet all that the Father gives to Jesus² will come to him; and he who comes will not be cast out. All is of God; yet each 'comes' by his own act. The Son has 'come down' from heaven to do the Father's will; so at 'the last day' nothing will be missing of what the Father has given (vv. 37-39). What the Father wills is explained in verse 40. It is 'that everyone who beholdeth the Son and believeth on him may have eternal life' now and resurrection hereafter.³ Judas, though chosen by Jesus, did not fulfil this condition (vv. 70, 71); and so it was not 'given to him'.⁴ In this he represented those that remain outside the 'all' of verses 37, 39. The interjections of 'the Jews' only serve to illustrate the main theme of 'the gospel of rejection'.⁵ 'Coming' to Jesus depends upon the 'drawing' of the Father. Prophetic words are thus fulfilled.⁶ Of this drawing he who alone 'has seen the Father' is the agent (12³², 6⁴⁶). The Father draws men to himself through the glory of the only Son uplifted on the Cross. For those who come and behold, the glory is unveiled. They believe and have eternal life now (vv. 40, 44-47). At verse 48 the discourse returns from 'seeing' to 'eating', from illumination to refreshment;⁷ and from verse 51 onwards the eucharistic reference becomes explicit.

We feast upon that glory which by faith we behold. The Word became flesh (1¹⁴) and poured out his blood for us (19³⁴). So the true disciple not only reclines upon Jesus' breast at supper, but also eats the flesh and drinks the blood of his Master. The glory incarnate is not only the object of our vision, but also the meat and drink of our souls. But the blood has been

¹ see above, Chapter VIII, pp. 249 ff

² *πάν* (v. 37). The whole body of the elect is God's gift to his Son (cp. v. 39).

³ On *θεωρῶν* see Bernard's notes here and on 2²³

⁴ cp. v. 65 and v. 44

⁵ cp. vv. 41-44 with chap. 12

⁶ v. 45; cp. Isa. 54¹³

⁷ cp. above, pp. 344, 345 and nn.

poured out in death; so we feast upon and enjoy the sacrificial life of Jesus. This true meat and drink is the indispensable means to eternal life now and to risen glory hereafter (vv. 51–55). Christ gave his flesh in sacrifice, not only for the disciples,¹ and not only for ‘the many’.² He gave it ‘for the life of the world’ (v. 51). Hence the offer of this gift is represented as being made publicly (v. 59). Yet only he who feasts upon the sacrifice shares with Jesus a mutual indwelling. So the common life of the Father and the Son is shared by the disciple (vv. 56, 57). For he shares the life of the ascended Son of Man, the Man from heaven who became a quickening spirit.³ To participate thus in the sacrifice of Jesus, in all senses of the word ‘participate’, is to have the joy which no man taketh away (16²²).

Additional Note E.

The Lord’s Supper and the Last Supper

In the text of Chapter XI Schweitzer’s theories upon this subject have been ignored. They involve a great deal that is speculative and a very individual treatment of the facts. In particular they disregard the evidence of our Lord’s words about his body and blood (e.g. *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle*, ET, p. 243). I have assumed that the Lord’s Supper, as celebrated at Corinth, followed the traditional order of the Last Supper; and that, therefore, the single eucharistic loaf, referred to in 1 Cor. 10¹⁶ (cp. 11²³), was blessed and broken by a presiding person some time after the meal had begun. The gathering was for no other purpose; it was not held for the *ordinary* purposes of eating and drinking, which could be done at home (1 Cor. 11^{22, 34}). It is also assumed that ‘the traditional order’ referred to can be found in the gospel records of the last supper. Now it is clear from St. Mark’s order, followed by St. Matthew, that the eucharistic institution occurred, not at the beginning of the meal, but after the discussion about the traitor. If Bernard is right with regard to the order of events implied in John 13 the institution took place after 13³⁰, which agrees with St. Mark’s order. Hoskyns is not convincing here. He holds that the Johannine-narrative (13^{1–30}) ‘presumes the words concerning the Bread and the Wine to have been already spoken’ (*The Fourth Gospel*, p. 518). The grounds for this statement are said to be given on pp. 506, 507, where a theory is offered of the relation of St. John’s Gospel to the synoptists. But this is not evidence. The real difficulty as to order lies in the uncertainties about both the text and the

¹ 1 Cor. 11²⁴

² Mark 14²⁴

³ cp. vv. 62, 63 with 1 Cor. 15^{45, 47}

significance of Luke 22^{14f}. Vigorous support for the longer text is offered by F. L. Cirlot (*The Early Eucharist*, pp. 241ff). If, however, we accept the shorter text provisionally, what was the order of events?

I have assumed that the cup in v. 17 is not eucharistic and that there is no account of the institution here apart from vv. 19, 20. To suppose with Creed (*The Gospel according to St. Luke*, pp. 261ff) that vv. 17-19a contain St. Luke's account of the institution raises insuperable difficulties. For (i) this would mean that St. Luke deliberately rejected the Pauline tradition with which, as St. Paul's companion and fellow-missionary, he must have been perfectly familiar. He would have been present at the Eucharist in Pauline churches; and if we may trust the 'we' narrative he was present on at least one occasion when St. Paul was the celebrant (Acts 20⁷⁻¹²). (ii) It would mean also that the solemn words of 1 Cor. 11²³ (and possibly also of 1 Cor. 15¹⁻⁴) about the *paradosis* had no significance for him. Even if he had not read 1 Corinthians he can scarcely have been ignorant of St. Paul's mind on this subject. (iii) It would involve a deliberate correction, not only of the Marcan order, but of several points on which the Pauline and Marcan (that is Petrine) traditions were in agreement. This would argue an indifference to the authority of 'the apostles' (Luke 22¹⁴, Acts 2⁴²), and of the two leading figures in the Acts, which is quite incredible.

The attempts, which were clearly made at a very early date, to bring St. Luke's narrative into line with the other two synoptists show the overwhelming strength of the Marcan and Pauline traditions. This tendency may even have obliterated the original wording of v. 19. It is natural to suppose that St. Luke's original narrative passed on from the Jewish *ḥabûrah* meal (expressly declared in v. 16 to be no passover) to the mention of the traitor without any account of the eucharistic institution. This would agree well with the Marcan order, except that a new place had to be found in v. 18 for the saying recorded in Mark 14²⁵. The omission would be deliberate as in St. John. It was one thing for St. Mark to give an account of the Christian rite soon after the first persecution. It would be quite another matter for gospels written for the great Greek communities of the empire at a later date to risk letting the sacred details of the rite fall into the hands of a hostile pagan world.

CHAPTER XII

MY FATHER AND YOUR FATHER

In Acts 2⁴² 'the breaking of the bread' is closely connected with 'the *koinonia*',¹ but also with 'the prayers'. As the central act of the common life it was essentially 'the participation', in all its aspects, as enacted in ritual form. But the 'participation' was also, in its widest meaning, a 'communion' with God in Christ through partaking of the Holy Spirit.² 'The breaking of the bread', therefore, became inevitably the heart and centre of the new life of prayer to which Christians had 'access' through the mediation of Christ.³ It seems probable that 'the prayers' to which the first Christians steadfastly adhered were the services of the Jewish temple.⁴ A similar phrase is used in Acts 1¹⁴, where we are told that after the Ascension the disciples returned to the 'upper room' (v. 13); and 'these all with one accord continued steadfastly in prayer'.⁵ Christian prayer took place at first in the upper room. Later we are told of a similar gathering for prayer in 'the house of Mary the mother of John whose surname was Mark; where many were gathered together and were praying' (12¹²). On an earlier occasion, also, the released apostles 'came to their friends'⁶ (4²³); and their report was followed by common prayer. 'And when they had prayed the place in which they were gathered together was shaken, and they were all filled with Holy Spirit

¹ cp. above, pp. 6, 72, and see p. 332

² cp. Chapter III, pp. 74-76

³ Rom 5², Eph. 2¹⁸, 1 John 1³, 2¹

⁴ cp. Luke 24⁵³, and see LC on Acts 1¹⁴ in *Beginnings I*, vol. iv, pp. 10, 11

⁵ cp. M: 'resorted with one mind to prayer.' On the other hand LC translate: 'These were all together attending the Place of prayer' (τῇ προσευχῇ). It was too early for a Christian 'synagogue' to have come into being. 'The Place', therefore, could only be the upper room, unless it was the temple. In view of v. 13 τῇ προσευχῇ seems to mean Christian prayer in the upper room, which supplemented the temple worship mentioned in Luke 24⁵³ and referred to in Acts 2⁴² (contrast the plural there with the singular here). The similar language of 6⁴ clearly means: 'give ourselves to prayer'.

⁶ Tr. LC; cp. M. RV has: 'to their own company'

and began to speak the word of God with boldness'¹ (4³¹). If 'the congregation of those who had believed'¹ (4³²) were all present, 'the place' must have been a large building (cp. 2⁴¹). In 2⁴⁶ we are told that the first Christians 'were with one accord regular in attendance in the Temple'.¹ This took place 'daily', and is coupled by contrast with 'breaking bread at home'. The latter is associated with 'praising God'.² Whatever 'breaking bread' may mean here, the primitive Christian community had certainly two modes of worship. The one was distinctively Christian, took place in their own assemblies, and had the Eucharist at its centre. The other consisted in attendance at the temple worship. The latter continued at least throughout the period covered by Acts (cp. 21^{23-27, 29}), and was supplemented by attendance in the synagogues.³

The close connexion of Christian prayer and worship, in their first beginnings, with Jewish forms of piety is now generally recognized.⁴ The importance of this connexion, in one of its aspects, appeared in the last chapter in relation to the significance of sacrificial feasts.⁵ It is, however, at least equally important to recognize the radically new element in Christian worship, and in the attitude of mind and spirit which it represented and expressed. This is most conspicuous in the words of eucharistic institution and in the corresponding teaching of John 6. But it is manifest also in the prayers which so frequently occur in the epistles. The new element is not absent even from 'the Lord's Prayer', notwithstanding its strongly Jewish tone.⁶ The distinctive character of Christian prayer, however, goes back to our Lord's own prayers, or rather to the significance of his prayer-life as the foundation of ours. The words: 'our Father', which sum up our prayers, have their basis in the word 'Father'

¹ Tr. LC

² and possibly 'giving him thanks before all the people' (LC, *ad loc.* in *op. cit.*, p. 30)

³ cp. 9²⁰, 13^{5, 14ff}, 14¹, 16^{13, 16}, 17^{1-3, 10}, 18⁵⁻⁸, 19²⁶, 19^{8, 9}. In 18⁷ and 19⁹ separation of 'the disciples' from the synagogue occurs. For a Christian synagogue see Jas. 2²

⁴ cp. Oesterley, *The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy*, and Gavin, *Jewish Antecedents of the Christian Sacraments*

⁵ see also Hicks, *The Fulness of Sacrifice*, pp. 234-237, on the Christian 'altar' in Heb. 13¹⁰⁻¹⁶

⁶ Oesterley, *op. cit.*, pp. 152, 153

which sums up his recorded prayers.¹ The longest of the recorded prayers of Jesus (John 17) has also many parallels with the Lord's Prayer.² This fact connects our prayers with his, as well as the Johannine teaching on prayer with the synoptic. Christian prayer is grounded upon the prayers of Christ, and also mediated through him,³ as our communion with the Father depends upon the Son.⁴ Our Lord refers in the gospels to 'my Father' or 'the Father', and again to 'your Father' or 'thy Father'. In the longer version of the Lord's Prayer he teaches the disciples to say: 'Our Father.'⁵ But he never associates himself with us in the use of the words: 'our Father.' These facts are summed up in his words to St. Mary Magdalene: 'I ascend unto my Father and your Father' (John 20¹⁷).

The Christian life is one of filial response to God our Father; and this response is expressed in prayer. The essence of prayer is this filial response to God. Life and prayer are, therefore, ideally two aspects of the same activity. Human life is only truly Christian in so far as it is, directly or indirectly, a movement of man's being in response to all that God is. But we can respond to that which God is, only in so far as that which God is has been revealed to us. The possibilities of this response to revelation already existed in the plan of creation. But the significance of that plan was made fully manifest only in Jesus Christ. Now in Chapter VI we saw that we have communion with the Father in and through the Son, that creation is the medium through which our predestined sonship is brought to actuality, and finally that the very meaning of creation is this human sonship as summed up in the Beloved Son. The voice of creation is dumb apart from man made in God's image, just as the animals are conceived as nameless until man gave them their identity.⁶ Creation becomes articulated in and through man. In Hebrew

¹ Matt. 11^{25, 26}, Mark 14³⁶ and parallels, Luke 10²¹, 23^{34, 46}, John 11⁴¹, 12^{27, 28}, and six times in John 17. The one exception (Mark 15³⁴ = Matt. 27⁴⁶) repeats the words of a psalm; but even so the exception is deeply significant.

² The details are in Bernard, p. 559, following Chase, *The Lord's Prayer in the Early Church*

³ cp. especially 2 Cor. 1²⁰, on which see above, Chapter V, p. 138. See also John 16²³⁻²⁷ and Matt. 18^{19, 20}

⁴ 1 John 1³. See above, p. 356, n. 3, and Chapter VI.

⁵ Matt. 6⁹ and context

⁶ Gen. 1^{26, 27}, 2^{19, 20}

prophecy there developed a conception of creation transformed through God's redemptive acts, and this was not unconnected with messianic hopes.¹ Human nature itself was to be healed and transformed:

Then shall the lame man leap as an hart, and the tongue of the dumb shall sing; for in the wilderness shall waters break out and streams in the desert. (Isa. 35⁶)

A similar passage provided the text of our Lord's sermon in the synagogue of Nazareth at the opening of his ministry (Luke 4¹⁸).

So our Lord's miracles of healing were signs of the new creation. As the Gospel was preached men's ears were opened to hear the voice of their heavenly Father calling them. Their lips were unsealed to respond. The story of the deaf and dumb man in Mark 7³¹⁻³⁷ is particularly significant. At the Lord's word: 'Be opened', 'his ears were opened and the bond of his tongue was loosed and he spake plain'. Shortly afterwards the inarticulate disciples were brought to confess the Messiah through the lips of Peter. The sign was repeated, again, when at the bidding of Peter 'a certain man that was lame from his mother's womb . . . entered with them into the temple, walking, and leaping, and praising God' (Acts 3²⁻⁸). So creation becomes articulate through restored humanity. The response of creation to the Creator finds its focus in redeemed humanity; and redeemed humanity, in turn, utters its praises to 'the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ'.² It is through the revelation of God in Christ that our lips are unsealed to utter the praises of the Creator. But this unsealing of dumb lips takes place through the revelation of the Creator in his essential nature as Father. We know God as Father, in turn, because the eyes of the spiritually blind have been opened to see the 'glory as of the only Son from the Father, full of grace and truth'.

It is characteristic of the biblical conception of worship that it begins in an adoring and grateful recognition of God in his 'revealed character', for which the biblical term is 'name'. The blessing of God's name is the beginning of prayer. For Christians that truth is expressed in the words: 'Our Father which art in heaven, hallowed be thy name.' Secondly it is also a deeply

¹ e.g. Isa. 11¹⁻⁹, 32, 35, 55, 61, 65^{17-end}, Zech. 14⁶⁻¹¹, Ps. 72

² 2 Cor. 1³; cp. Rom. 1⁸, Col. 1³, Eph. 1³, 1 Pet. 1³

rooted biblical conception that God's name is to be hallowed for his works in creation and in redemption. These two themes are constant in the psalms, in the prophets, and in the wisdom books. Sometimes the two are kept distinct, one following the other antiphonally, as Psalm 104 is followed by Psalm 105. Sometimes again they cross one another and are intermingled;¹ and that for a significant reason. For the classic acts of God's redeeming power were effected through his marvellous works in the Exodus, when the powers of nature were enrolled on the side of Israel from the plagues of Egypt to the passage of Jordan and the walls of Jericho.² The virility of faith, in its biblical meaning, is bound up with the conviction that redemptive history is controlled by the Creator of heaven and earth. 'Thy testimonies are very sure' because 'the Lord on high is mighty.'³ 'Thou that art throned upon the cherubim . . . come to save us.'⁴ The two cherubim upon the cover of the ark, in the tabernacle and in the temple, testified to an early conviction that the God of Israel is a creative God. This was, doubtless, the background of Ezekiel's vision (Ezek. 1). So too in Isaiah's vision in the temple the Lord is surrounded by the praises of the seraphim, as representatives of creation (Isa. 6). The two visions are combined in the Revelation of St. John (ch. 4).

In the theophany to Ezekiel the glory of the Shekinah enthroned upon four 'living creatures'⁵ appeared 'among the captives in the land of the Chaldeans by the river Chebar' (1¹⁻³); for God is where his people are. But in the book as a whole the presence of God enthroned upon the cherubim is associated with the temple still. In chapters 9-11 the same theophany appears in the temple-court for an assize of judgement before departing from the apostate city (11²³). Again in the vision of the New Jerusalem at the end of the book the glory of God, as in the first vision (43³), returns to the restored temple, no longer in judgement but in reconciliation (43¹⁻⁹, cp. 44⁴). So

¹ cp. Ps. 74¹²⁻¹⁹

² cp. the prayer of Jeremiah (32¹⁷⁻²⁸), referred to above in Chapter VIII, p. 240, n. 4

³ Ps. 93^{4, 5}; cp. Ps. 46 and the whole series of Pss. 95-100

⁴ Ps. 80^{1, 2}; cp. Ps. 99¹ and 1 Sam. 4⁴. See also Briggs (ICC), *ad loc.* (vol. ii, pp. 202, 203)

⁵ identified with the cherubim in 10¹, 11²²

too in Ezekiel 10 judgement is effected upon Jerusalem through the scattering of 'coals of fire from between the cherubim'.¹ On the other hand in Isaiah's vision a live coal from off the altar purges away the prophet's sins.² Here the representatives of creation administer reconciliation or judgement from the altar of God. The powers of creation co-operate in the divine acts of redemptive history. The holiness of Israel's covenant-God is enthroned amidst the splendours of creation; and the boundless resources of the Creator minister to the purposes of his holy love.

In the Christian Apocalypse the representatives of redeemed humanity unite with the voices of nature to sing the praises of the Creator. Then the paschal Lamb is discerned in the midst of the throne, as the controller of human destiny. Both creations join in singing the praises of the victorious redeemer-victim; and finally the whole of creation renders adoration 'to him that sitteth upon the throne and to the Lamb' (Rev. 4, 5). All this is the biblical background of the early liturgies of the Church. In them there also appears another typically Jewish feature, namely the proclamation of the divine acts of redemption,³—a liturgical counterpart of the baptismal creed. This is the most ancient form of the eucharistic canon,⁴ in conformity with the precept recorded by St. Paul: 'Do this in remembrance of me' (1 Cor. 11^{24, 25}). God is revealed in his acts. His supreme act in Jesus Christ evokes the responsive and commemorative adoration of the Church for his transcendent holiness made accessible to us in gracious and merciful condescension. This fundamental biblical conception of divine holiness, separate yet made accessible, is expressed in the words of the prophet:

Thus saith the high and lofty One that inhabiteth eternity, whose name is Holy: I dwell in the high and holy place, with him also that is of a contrite and humble spirit. (Isa. 57¹⁵)

There is a further point in the law of God's self-communicating action, which is illustrated throughout the Bible in the call

¹ Ezek. 10^{2, 6, 7} (received from a cherub)

² Isa. 6⁵⁻⁷ (received from a seraph)

³ On the Jewish *kerygma* cp. W. L. Knox, *op. cit.*, pp. 122, 123

⁴ cp. *Texts and Studies*, vol. viii, no. 4: *The so-called Egyptian Church Order*, by R. H. Connolly (Cambridge 1916), p. 176; *The Primitive Consecration Prayer*, by W. H. Frere (Alcuin Club), pp. 23ff; *The Apostolic Tradition of St. Hippolytus*, by Dom Gregory Dix, pp. 7-9

of patriarchs, prophets and apostles. It is impossible to receive a revelation of God's holy character without also receiving a challenging call to respond to the revelation by co-operating with God's holy purpose. The vision of Isaiah, again, provides an instance. So also do the calls of Jeremiah and Ezekiel. As soon as God's holy name evoked a response in them, they found themselves summoned to a life of arduous service in the promotion of his sovereign rule among men. To know God's holy name through his acts of love and power involves grateful recognition of his right to claim our service. 'The poor in spirit' have as their reward 'the kingdom of heaven'.¹ Because they are humbled by God's holy love they recognize the supreme authority of that holy love to be their rule. So the accepted 'rule of God' is their beatitude. But to be dedicated to the rule of God is to desire and pray for its perfected manifestation here on earth as it is already in heaven. The second clause of the Lord's Prayer follows inevitably upon the first. So our Lord, who had from his early years loved his Father's house,² and who had at his baptism heard himself acknowledged by his Father's voice, was inevitably forced³ into the wilderness by the Spirit to be tested concerning his self-dedication to the service of God's realm. He alone, however, is the Servant, who, accepting 'the rule of God' as his law, was himself the complete embodiment of that rule.

Yet the fact that in him the whole 'realm of God' was present in action did not exempt him from the arduous testing involved in submission to God's rule. Just the reverse was the case. The whole conflict of God's realm with the powers of evil found its focus in him.⁴ 'Though he was a Son,'⁵ he 'yet learned obedience by the things which he suffered'.⁶ Though he was the Son who is the effulgence of the Father's glory,⁷ yet he submitted himself to the yoke of the Law and to the full force of temptation, to the conflict with evil spirits and the gainsaying of sinners, finally to the agony and the desolation, in entire surrender to the Father's will. The acceptance of God's rule involves a surrender of will. The second petition leads to the

¹ Matt. 5³² Luke 2⁴⁹; cp. John 2¹⁶³ Mark 1¹²: ἐκβάλλει⁴ Luke 11²⁰ (= Matt. 12²⁸); and compare the context of both texts with Mark 3²²⁻³⁰⁵ 'Son though he was' (M)⁶ Heb. 5⁸⁷ Heb. 1³

third, which is the heart, not only of the Lord's Prayer, but of all prayer. The service of God's kingdom involves sacrifice. Israel, by receiving the communication of God's holy name, was made to be 'a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation' (Exod. 19⁶). The entire people became a realm of consecrated persons dedicated to the worship of the true God and the showing forth of his righteousness. The implications of this national consecration were unfolded in the course of their national history. Ultimately their dedication to be a priestly people was seen to involve the shattering of all worldly and merely secular ambitions as vain delusions. What was involved, however, was only fully seen with the eyes of the New Israel, when the true national vocation of sacrificial service had been fulfilled by the Christ.

Accordingly, because the whole realm of God was present in him, it follows that the whole priestly vocation of Israel was fulfilled by him. The law of their vocation was declared in these words: 'I am the Lord your God: sanctify yourselves therefore, and be ye holy; for I am holy' (Lev. 11⁴⁴). The reason assigned for this vocation in both passages¹ is their deliverance by God from the bondage of Egypt. These associations are recalled by our Lord's 'high-priestly' prayer at the end of the discourse in the upper room. Now at a turning-point in the fourth gospel which has close connexions with the night of the betrayal² the inner circle of disciples survived a crucial stage of their initiation, because they recognized in Jesus 'the Holy One of God'.³ So on the night when a new redemption from Egypt was about to be accomplished, God's Holy One, who in his own person was both the people of Israel and the divine Redeemer, addressed himself to the fulfilment of Israel's consecration. The Holy Son completed the sanctification of Israel, God's son.⁴ The Holy Son addressed his prayer to the Holy Father (John 17¹¹), hallowing the Father's name, and pleading for the establishment of the Father's rule through the glorification of the Son (vv. 2, 5). The name of the Father has been hallowed through its manifestation to the disciples (v. 6). Now the Father's glory is also to be manifested in the sacrifice of the

¹ Exod. 19⁴⁻⁶, Lev. 11⁴⁵

² see above, Chapter XI, pp. 351ff

³ John 6⁶⁹; cp. 10³⁶

⁴ Exod. 4^{22, 23}, Hos. 11¹

Son, that all men may be drawn to acknowledge it.¹ The main purport of the prayer is the committal of the New Israel to the tender care of the Father, that the purpose of God may be fulfilled in and through them.

As the prayer develops there appears in it an intimate union between the Redeemer and the New Israel, between the Holy One and 'those whom thou hast given me' (v. 9).² As in chapter 10²⁷⁻³⁰ the sheep are safe in the Father's hand, because the Good Shepherd and the Father 'are one', so here the ground of the Son's prayer for the disciples is the fact that they are the possession of both the Father and the Son. The Son prays for them with confidence because 'they are thine, and all mine are thine and thine are mine' (v. 10). The Father has given the disciples to the Son; the Son, in turn, having received them from the Father's hand entrusts them again to the Father's safe-keeping. Because they are branches of the Vine, they are under the care of the divine Husbandman (15¹⁻⁸). Here, however, we see the complementary truth. He who is the Vine is also the only-begotten Son. His union with the Father in the divine *koinonia* includes within itself his union with the disciples, as the greater includes the less.³ Accordingly the whole prayer may be regarded as offered for the single divine-human organism, the genuine Vine of Israel, the sole and adequate organ through which the Father's name is to be hallowed, his kingdom is to come, and his will is to be done, on earth as in heaven.⁴ The organism of the New Israel is not complete in and by itself. Such an idea would destroy its very meaning. For it is the organ of the divine *koinonia*, the means through which the union of the Father and the Son is projected into redemptive history and ultimately into the life of creation as a whole. At present the 'order' of this world⁵ is disordered. But the Son came down into the world, 'that the world may know that thou didst send me' (v. 23).⁶

The quotation just made from verse 23 expresses the goal of the prayer, the conversion of the world. That, however, lies in

¹ cp. 12³² with 17⁶⁻⁸ and 17^{20ff}

² cp. 6^{37, 39}

³ cp. 1 John 1⁸, and see Chapter VI, pp. 157-160

⁴ rightly printed by WH in Matt. 6^{9, 10} so that the words 'as in heaven, so on earth' belong to all the three preceding clauses

⁵ κόσμος

⁶ cp. 3¹⁶

the future. In the upper room Jesus is deeply aware that the world which he came to save is hostile both to himself and to his disciples. Their close union with him is marked by this fact that they with him are joint objects of the world's hatred (17¹⁴).¹ The opposition lies between the world and 'the Holy One of God', because 'the world as a whole lies in the evil one'.² Jesus and his disciples form the holy community which is contrasted with the world. 'The ruler of the world' comes, 'and has nothing in me.' Satan has nothing of which he can take hold in the sinless Son. But none the less his assault is coming; and Jesus must go to meet it 'that the world may know that I love the Father' (14^{30,31}). The world is to be rescued from the power of Satan by the supreme conflict for which Jesus now prepares. With this conflict in view the Lord makes two petitions for the Eleven: (1) for their deliverance from the evil one; and (2) for their consecration.³ Both petitions mark the share of the disciples in our Lord's conflict and sacrifice through their share in his separation from the world as the Holy One of God.⁴ In the world but not of it, they are committed to the Father's care for protection from the power of evil, and for consecration to the service of the holy God. With this prayer the New Israel is equipped for the New Exodus, and is made partaker in the consecration of the Redeemer himself.

The sphere of their consecration and the means whereby it is effected is the revelation of God in Christ (v. 17). Through that revelation of the Father's name, the name has already been hallowed (cp. v. 6); now the disciples are to be hallowed in the name, that is in the revealed truth of God's manifested character. The consecration of the disciples, however, is dependent upon that of their Master, just as their new birth was dependent upon him (1¹²). As they 'believe on his name', that is, his manifested character, they accept the Father's 'word' which he brings. They know the message to be true, because they know him to be the Holy One of God, that is God's anointed representative. They have learnt also that he is 'the way and the truth and the life', and that 'he that hath seen me hath seen the Father' (14^{6,9}). Jesus is the incarnate truth, the embodied

¹ cp. 15^{18,19}² whereas 'we are of God' (1 John 5¹⁹)³ vv. 15, 17; with the first compare Matt. 6¹³ and Rev. 3¹⁰⁴ cp. 6⁶⁶⁻⁷⁰, 15¹⁵⁻²⁵

revelation of the Father. To be consecrated 'in the truth', therefore, really means to be consecrated in and with his consecration. Their separation unto holiness depends upon his in every respect. Their consecration is included in his. Their life is wrapped up in his, as the branches in the Vine. But the branches are in the Vine, that they may bring forth fruit. So the consecration of our Lord and his disciples was a separation or setting apart for the service of God. Consecration involves mission, and with the same relation of dependence. Their mission depends upon his.

As thou didst send me into the world, even so sent I them into the world.

And for their sakes I consecrate myself, that they themselves also may be consecrated in truth. (John 17^{18, 19})¹

This utterance should be compared with others in the same gospel. In 10³⁶ the two ideas of mission and consecration are connected in our Lord's reply to the charge of blasphemy: 'Say ye of him, whom the Father consecrated and sent into the world, Thou blasphemest; because I said, I am the Son of God?' The connexion of thought is significant. The title 'the Holy One of God' is here fully explained. Jesus declares himself to be he 'whom the Father consecrated and sent into the world'. The consecration was prior to the Incarnation; it was the solemn setting apart for the mission fulfilled in the Incarnation. Moreover this explanation is offered in justification of his claim to be the Son of God. For the mission to which he was consecrated establishes the claim. This is made clear in what follows. Jesus asserts that they may judge his claim through the character of the works which he does in fulfilment of his mission. 'If I do not the works of my Father believe me not.' Let actions bear witness, 'that ye may know and understand that the Father is in me and I in the Father.' The sonship is revealed in 'the works of my Father'. The mutual abiding of the Father and the Son may be known from the Son's fulfilment in his incarnate life of the mission to which he was consecrated (10³⁶⁻³⁸).

This passage declares, in effect, that in the earthly life of Jesus there was a revelation of the 'glory as of the only-begotten from the Father'. The Father consecrated him to the mission which consisted in the manifesting of this glory. Through the mani-

¹ For this rendering cp. RV margin to vv. 17, 19

festation of the glory men were to believe and so have eternal life (cp. 3¹⁶). The same thing was also stated in slightly different terms in 6³⁷⁻⁴⁰, where there is the same emphasis upon the Father's sending of the Son, and upon the goal of the mission for mankind, namely vision, faith and eternal life. Here, however, expression is given to a fundamental implication of the mission which has a direct bearing upon the prayer in chapter 17: 'I have come down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me' (6³⁸).¹ It was because our Lord perfectly fulfilled this condition, that the disciples came to recognize in him 'the Holy One of God'. The Father consecrated the Son to manifest his glory in this world. This mission, however, involved the rejection of the Son. He came as the Light of the world. But 'men loved the darkness rather than the light, for their works were evil' (3¹⁹). Yet the knowledge that he would be rejected did not turn him from his path. The offer of eternal life must be made under the conditions willed by the Father. So consecration involved mission; and the mission accepted involved rejection.² The Johannine prayer: 'Holy Father', led straight to the Marcan prayer: 'Abba, Father'.

In other words our Lord's consecration to be God's anointed messenger to this world involved from the first the agony of Gethsemane and the desolation of Calvary. For the Holy One of God is he who knows perfectly the holiness of his Father, and who therefore must proclaim that holiness to a world which does not desire to know it. But further, he knows that holiness as essentially self-communicating.³ He himself manifested 'the name' to the disciples, with the result that 'thy word they have kept . . . for the words which thou gavest to me I have given to them' (17^{6,8}). Through receiving these words into their hearts they had come to recognize (v. 7), and now 'knew of a truth' (v. 8), the divine origin and significance of our Lord's mission. That mission, repeatedly referred to in the prayer,⁴

¹ cp. 4³⁴, 5³⁰

² Once again these three ideas correspond to the first three petitions of the Lord's Prayer

³ cp. Isa. 57¹⁵ as illustrated by Isa. 6 and Ezek. 1, on which see above, pp. 361, 362

⁴ five times, the phrase 'thou didst send me' 'being repeated like a kind of solemn refrain' (Bernard, p. 565)

was the foundation of theirs (v. 18); and they came to the knowledge of it through God's imparted word of truth, the sphere and medium of their consecration. Their consecration, indeed, and the mission in which it would issue were not only founded upon his, but also implicit in his and of one pattern with his. For the life of the Vine and its branches is one. These truths extend too in essence to all whom the prayer includes (vv. 20ff). For the Church shares our Lord's mediatorial functions, prophetic and priestly. She is called to manifest 'the name', and to embody the worshipful response to 'the name' so manifested. Indeed 'the words' of the message must be embodied in 'the works'¹ of the response, if they are to bear fruit. This fruitful result, however, can come only if one condition is fulfilled: 'If ye abide in me and my words abide in you, ask whatsoever ye will, and it shall be done unto you' (15⁷).

The saying just quoted is a Johannine parallel to the synoptic doctrine of the connexion between faith and prayer. Those synoptic sayings, referred to in Chapter VIII,² employ an imagery which suggests that prayer may actually change the course of earthly events. Now there is one clause in the Lord's Prayer which, above all others, comes to mind in such a connexion. It is the fourth petition: 'Give us to-day our bread for the coming day.'³ However widely we interpret these words they must at least include the thought of bodily needs being satisfied. A purely spiritual interpretation would be artificial, and inconsistent with the context in both gospels.⁴ None the less in both cases the context also points beyond material benefits to spiritual blessings.⁵ Our Lord taught the blessedness of those 'who hunger and thirst after righteousness, for they shall be filled' (Matt. 5⁶). He also pointed beyond 'the meat which perisheth' to 'the meat which abideth unto eternal life, which the Son of man shall give unto you' (John 6²⁷). He quoted to the tempter the words of Deuteronomy (8³): 'man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God' (Matt. 4⁴). 'The righteousness'⁶ of

¹ cp. 10^{37, 38}, 14¹³

² see above, pp. 235ff

³ On the probable meaning of *ἐπιούσιον* we cannot, as yet, advance beyond the remarks of MM (pp. 242, 243)

⁴ Matt. 6²⁵⁻³⁴, Luke 11⁵⁻¹³

⁵ Matt. 6^{19ff, 33}, Luke 11¹³

⁶ with the article in Matt. 5⁶

the fourth beatitude is clearly God's righteousness, which in biblical teaching is manifested in God's historical acts of redemption. To hunger and thirst for this righteousness is therefore to pray that God's kingdom may come on earth as in heaven. Our Lord promised a place in that kingdom to his disciples; and this promise is associated both with the new birth of the world and with the messianic feast of those who eat and drink 'at my table in my kingdom'.¹ The two great sacraments, and with them the whole redeemed life to which they belong, point forward to that eschatological goal of which they are the 'effectual signs'.

But this future kingdom, in which the prayer for to-morrow's bread will be finally answered, is promised only to those who have fulfilled the condition of discipleship. 'Ye who followed me,' 'ye which have continued with me in my temptations,' are those to whom the words are addressed. Those who pray for to-morrow's bread have a right to expect an answer only if they have first offered the three earlier petitions from the heart. For this eschatological bread is in its full meaning 'the living bread which came down from heaven' (John 6⁵¹). If Jesus at the last supper looked forward himself to 'that day' when he would drink new wine in the kingdom of God (Mark 14²⁵), it was also true that in the works which he did the rule of God was already present,² because, in Johannine language, they were 'the works of my Father'. The disciples would share the glory, if they shared the conflict and trial, seeing that both belong to Jesus. The future glory of God's realm is organically connected with its present conditions of conflict, humiliation and suffering. For just as 'to-morrow's bread' will one day be the full and finally satisfying messianic feast, so already here and now a foretaste of that feast is granted to those who hunger and thirst after the divine righteousness. Already the divine righteousness is made accessible to us in Jesus, 'the living bread which came down from heaven.'

The righteousness which is to satisfy our spiritual hunger and thirst is the righteousness of God as it was finally manifested in his Beloved Son. It is in fact the 'glory as of the only-begotten from the Father'. It is the righteousness of him who said: 'my meat is to do the will of him that sent me, and to

¹ Matt. 19²⁸, Luke 22^{28, 30}

² see above, p. 362, and n. 4

accomplish his work.¹ Here the third and fourth petitions of the Paternoster are perfectly fused into one principle of life. In the prayer we are taught to pray that God's will may be done on earth as in heaven. In order that we may be equipped to co-operate in the doing of God's will we are next taught to pray for all things needful to be supplied for body and soul. That is the disciples' prayer; it corresponds to the address: 'Our Father.' But in the great Johannine saying just quoted there is for Jesus himself no such dichotomy. His Father's will is his daily bread. It is all that he needs. No other food is indispensable for him. As for the remaining petitions, he needs no forgiveness; and doing the Father's will he passes unscathed through his supreme trial; for 'the prince of the world' comes indeed, but has nothing in him. As the disciples' prayer corresponds to: 'Our Father,' so the Master's saying that God's will is his food corresponds to: 'My Father.'

This saying of our Lord reveals the contrast between the Vine and the branches, between the Shepherd and the sheep. Our prayers will be answered, if we abide in him and his words abide in us. We need nourishment and forgiveness, protection and deliverance; and we find them all in him. He came down from heaven to satisfy all our needs, 'full of grace and truth.' We find complete satisfaction in him; for we partake of his fulness. But what is his fulness? It is, according to St. John, the glory of the only Son which was most completely manifested upon the Cross. It is the glory of him whose meat was his Father's will, though that will led him to Gethsemane and to Calvary. It is the glory of him whose life was expressed in the words: 'holy Father.' Only once does St. John lift the veil of spiritual travail and strain which hung over the soul of Jesus in his Passion. That lifting of the veil occurs, before the Passion begins, in the incident of the Voice from heaven and the cry, 'Father, save me from this hour,' which quickly passes into that other cry, 'Father, glorify thy name' (12²⁷). But there are other indications in this gospel of our Lord's soul being troubled, as when he wept for the bereavement of his friends (11³³⁻³⁸),² or when he grieved over the treachery of his disciple (13²¹)³ or foretold

¹ John 4³⁴; cp. in 17²⁵ the implications of: 'O righteous Father . . . I knew thee'

² but see Bernard's note on v. 33 (p. 392)

³ cp. 6⁷⁰

his desertion by the Eleven (16³²).¹ The last instance brings out the contrast between him and them: 'that ye shall be scattered, every man to his own, and shall leave me alone: and yet I am not alone, because the Father is with me'.² He is with his Father over against them in their sins and weakness.

This contrast between him and them, between his consecration and theirs (17¹⁹) sets forth in solitary grandeur his sayings about doing the Father's will. In the theophany of the holy God in the temple Isaiah had *heard* the words of the Lord and responded to them. Jeremiah (15¹⁵⁻¹⁸) went further:

For thy sake I have suffered reproach. Thy words were found, and I did eat them; and thy words were unto me a joy and the rejoicing of mine heart.

But this was no earthly joy; for he goes on to say:

I sat not in the assembly of them that make merry, nor rejoiced: I sat alone because of thy hand; for thou hast filled me with indignation.

Eating God's words brings joy; yet his pain is perpetual, his wound incurable. The joy of spiritual eating is succeeded by the pains of sacrifice, because the words are sacrificial words. The experience of Ezekiel was of the same type, but is related in a more graphic form. He was bidden to eat 'a roll of a book', which was sweet as honey to the taste, but the eating was followed by 'bitterness'.³ Now our Lord, in St. John, hears the Father's words and makes them known both to the disciples and 'into the world'.⁴ But he is himself the incarnate Word and the only-begotten Son (1¹⁴). He is the whole revelation of the Father and equally the response to that revelation. So his food is the Father's will. He receives the glory of that will made known to him. He assimilates its substance as his food; and he is strengthened by this food to offer his whole self in filial response of love. The Father's will becomes his will; and his will is offered to the Father in consecrated and loving response embodied in 'the works' of the Father. The final work of this

¹ cp. 13³⁸, 14¹

² so RV; but 'the *lva* marks the predestined sequence of events' (Bernard, p. 523). Cp. Zech. 13⁷, Mark 14²⁷.

³ Ezek. 2⁸⁻³³, 14; the whole picture is reproduced in Rev. 10⁸⁻¹¹

⁴ John 15¹⁵, 17^{8, 14}, 8²⁸, 12⁴⁹

response is the work of sacrifice which is 'finished' only when it is completed in death (19⁸⁰).

The indications of trouble in our Lord's soul, which appear in certain passages of the fourth gospel,¹ though slight in themselves, are of great importance, and that not only because they emphasize his true humanity. They draw attention not only to the reality of his human probation, but also to the bitterness of his sacrifice. If eating God's words brought bitterness to the souls of the prophets, what depths of woe were plumbed by the incarnate Word as he fed upon his Father's will and willingly made himself a sacrifice for our sins! Behind the serenity of our Lord's words and actions in St. John's Gospel lies this aspect of his sacrifice. The glory of which this evangelist writes was sacrificial through and through. We partake of the fulness of that glory when we eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink his blood. But when we so partake, we are feeding upon the sacrifice which was rendered necessary by our sins and the sins of the whole world. The glory of which we partake was offered in expiation for sinners, that we might be forgiven. We are admitted to the banquet of his sacrifice, because our sins have been forgiven through the offering of that sacrifice. We partake of the peace-offering, because he 'made his soul an offering for sin'.² We have the right to pray: 'Forgive us our trespasses' because he was able to say: 'My meat is to do the will of him that sent me, and to accomplish his work.' We have communion with the Father and with his Son in a life common to God and man, because 'we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous: and he is the propitiation for our sins'.³

In a previous chapter it was remarked that 'the apostles' teaching' was destined to draw the Church away from 'the prayers' of the Jewish temple into an order of worship distinctive of 'the *koinonia*' with 'the breaking of the bread' as its central act.⁴ The Epistle to the Hebrews is a document which illustrates this process very clearly. It expounds the significance of our Lord's priesthood and of his sacrifice in terms drawn from the cultus of the Mosaic tabernacle. As there the institu-

¹ see above, pp. 370, 371

² Isa. 53¹⁰

³ 1 John 1³, 7, 2¹, 2²; cp. Chapter VI

⁴ see above, p. 332, and cp. p. 356

tion of sacrifice was the instrument of man's approach to God in worship, so the inner meaning of all sacrificial systems finds fulfilment in the self-oblation of Christ. It is an implicit assumption of the whole argument that the true worship is that which finds its focus in Christ's sacrifice, and that the true worshipping community is one which, as in the Apocalypse, has the divine Priest-Victim at its centre.¹ As in 1 Corinthians 10¹⁵⁻²², so in this epistle the argument depends both upon analogy and upon contrast. The analogy with the Jewish sacrificial system at which St. Paul only glanced in that passage (10¹⁸) is here worked out in detail. The main point of connexion is found in the symbolism of the Jewish Day of Atonement.² On the other hand, the contrast is worked out with the help of two leading concepts, one taken from the Old Testament and the other from Greek philosophy:

(1) In the Greek version of Psalm 110³ the author of Hebrews read these words: 'I begat thee before the morning-star'.³ He found here a reference to our Lord as the eternal Son of God. Now this psalm was inscribed 'to David';⁴ and it ascribed to a king of David's line priestly functions, which were contrasted with those of the Aaronic priests:

The Lord hath sworn, and will not repent,
Thou art a priest for ever
After the order of Melchizedek. (Ps. 110⁴)

This text is quoted in Hebrews 5⁶; and the context explains the occasion when the oath took place. The author is arguing that

¹ cp. Heb. 10¹⁹⁻²⁵ with Rev. 5, and Heb. 12²²⁻²⁴ with Rev. 21²²⁻²²⁵

² Lev. 16 and Heb. 9^{7, 11-15, 24-28}, 10¹⁹⁻²²; cp. 2¹⁷, 13¹¹

³ Ps. 109³ (LXX)

⁴ Both Hebrew and Greek have 'a psalm to David' prefixed to the psalm. Briggs has argued that the core of the psalm is pre-exilic and was actually addressed to 'David', i.e. to the Davidic dynasty. He points out that the Melchizedekian high-priesthood was not appropriate to the Maccabean kings, who belonged to the Levitical priesthood. Our Lord shared with his hearers and opponents the traditional assumption of a 'Davidic' connexion (Mark 12³⁵⁻³⁷ and parallels). See Briggs (ICC), vol. ii, pp. 373-376. In any case the slightest suggestion of a Maccabean reference would have ruined the argument of the Epistle to the Hebrews that the Aaronic priesthood and covenant had been superseded (cp. 7¹⁴). Apparently in New Testament times no one questioned the view that the psalm was addressed to 'David' or to the messianic king.

no one takes upon himself the office of high-priest. Aaron was called to the office. But so also was the Messiah. He did not 'glorify himself to become high-priest'. He was appointed by God in the words of Psalm 2: 'Thou art my Son, This day have I begotten thee.' Then follows the quotation from Psalm 110⁴ (vv. 4-6). The author of Hebrews therefore referred the divine oath of Psalm 110⁴ to the same occasion as the decree of sonship for the Davidic dynasty. He understood the words of 2 Samuel 7¹²⁻¹⁶ to be a promise not only of messianic sonship and sovereignty but also of priestly functions. Now 2 Samuel 7¹³ foretells the building of the temple by Solomon, and 1 Kings 8 ascribes to Solomon priestly functions of sacrifice, prayer and benediction on the occasion of the temple's dedication.¹ Moreover, David is said to have worn a linen ephod, when dancing before the ark;² and this garment was priestly.³ In ancient times kings had a priestly character, a fact which is epitomized in the picture of Melchizedek in Genesis 14.

St. Paul had appealed behind the Mosaic covenant to the promises made to Abraham. The author of Hebrews appeals behind Moses to the figure of Melchizedek, the priest-king to whom Abraham paid tithes. Psalm 110 is understood to mean that the messianic king of David's line has a priesthood after the order of Melchizedek. This priesthood is greater than that of Aaron ordained in the Mosaic Law and belongs to a higher and better covenant, as Melchizedek was superior to Abraham, the ancestor of the Levitical priests. The author accepts St. Paul's argument for the superiority of Abraham to Moses, but places Melchizedek above both. He argues that as the promise to Abraham was confirmed by an oath, so too was the promise to the dynasty of David (Ps. 110⁴), whereas the Levitical priesthood had no such oath to confirm it. The perfect priesthood, therefore, belongs to our Lord, because he is the messianic king of David's line to whom the oath in the psalm was made. The author also finds other symbolic details in the picture of Melchizedek, which make him superior to the Levitical priesthood, and which are fulfilled in the high-priesthood of Christ (6¹³-8¹).

(2) The second leading concept is taken from the philosophy of Plato, who believed that this visible world which we appre-

¹ 1 Kings 8⁵, 22ff, 54-64

² 2 Sam. 6¹⁴, 1 Chron. 15²⁷

³ Exod. 28⁴, 6-12, 1 Sam. 2¹⁸

hend with our senses points beyond itself to an invisible world of spiritual 'ideas'. All things in this world are symbols of spiritual realities in that world. The spiritual world is the real world, whereas the things of sense are only shadows and copies of the higher realities. The real world is not only spiritual but also eternal, whereas our lower world is not only shadowy but also temporal and transient. The author of Hebrews makes this contrast correspond to the difference between the Old Testament dispensation and the new Christian covenant. The whole of the institutions of the Mosaic Law, including the tabernacle and its furniture, the priesthood, sacrifices and priestly actions, are therefore nothing but shadows and copies, or (as we should say) types of the spiritual realities which we enjoy in the Christian covenant. He applies this idea to the doctrine of atonement for sin. Moses was told to make the tabernacle and its furniture 'according to the pattern that was shown thee in the mount'.¹ This 'pattern' is taken to signify a real heavenly tabernacle, the only true one. The author then explains that all the details of the Jewish Day of Atonement foreshadowed the real atonement which has been effected by Jesus, the true high-priest, in the heavenly tabernacle. The Jewish high-priest once a year sacrificed animal victims for himself and the people at the great altar in the temple-court, according to the order laid down for the tabernacle in Leviticus 16. He then took the blood of the victims into the Holy of Holies within the veil and sprinkled it upon 'the mercy-seat' which covered the sacred ark. The action was intended to effect atonement for the whole nation, restoring them to communion with God. But all this was a mere shadow of the real atonement effected by Christ (8¹-9¹⁵, 9²⁴-10²²).² The author teaches that the priesthood of our Lord and the sacrifice which he offered belong to an eternal order of reality which cannot pass away. But he does not allow philosophy to dominate his argument. For his heavenly order, although contrasted with the Mosaic system of worship, is not separated from this earthly scene and its events. He is not advocating a purely spiritual religion. His emphasis upon the fulfilment of messianic prophecy in our Lord shows that he attaches the highest importance to biblical history. He finds in

¹ Heb. 8⁵, quoting Exod. 25⁴⁰

² For further details see above in Chapter VI, pp. 169-171

the events of history a new importance because of their significance for eternity. For example, he follows St. Paul in applying Psalm 2⁷ and the promise in 2 Samuel 7¹⁴ to our Lord as the Messiah of David's line.¹ But he does not attach the fulfilment of this promise to the resurrection, as St. Paul had done, nor to any other specific moment in our Lord's earthly life. These two texts are first quoted to illustrate his great preface, in which he describes the eternal status and divine functions of God's Son (1¹⁻⁵). It is the eternal sonship of Jesus *as* the messianic king which he counts important.² The texts are quoted because they point to the truth that the eternal Son of God entered human history in accordance with God's plan for our salvation from sin (in contrast to the angels through whom the Mosaic Law was mediated). He deals with Psalm 110 in a similar way. Here, however, there was one particular event which was vital to his argument. For this writer our Lord's saving work was both a priestly act of sacrifice and also a victory over the devil (2¹⁴⁻¹⁸). The Ascension marked the completion of his saving work in both of these aspects. This is perfectly expressed at the conclusion of the preface in the words: 'who . . . when he had made purification of sins sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high' (1³).

His favourite psalm began with the words:

The Lord said to my Lord,
Sit thou on my right hand,
Till I make thine enemies the footstool of thy feet.³

The traditional meaning of this text must have been connected with David's conquest of the stronghold of Zion and his victories over the surrounding nations. For the Christian writer it meant the heavenly session of the Christ as God's Son at the right hand of the Father after his victory over the spiritual hosts of evil had been completed by the Ascension.⁴ The text

¹ cp. Rom. 1^{3,4}, and see above, pp. 270ff

² The messianic office is grounded in the eternal sonship. The Christ is 'a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek' by the Father's decree and in virtue of that sonship (5^{6, 6}), whereas Melchizedek was 'made like unto the Son of God' (7³). The type *presupposed* the antitype in which it was fulfilled.

³ This rendering of Ps. 110¹ follows LXX, the last two lines being given as quoted in Heb. 1¹³ (RV).

⁴ His substantial agreement with St. Paul may be seen from the use made

suited his purpose for another reason. For the person addressed in the psalm is a priest-king like Melchizedek. Now David and Solomon exercised priestly functions.¹ David brought the ark in triumph to Jerusalem, and Solomon replaced the tabernacle by a more permanent sanctuary, at whose dedication he offered a great prayer of intercession. David wore an ephod, a garment like that appointed for Aaron. On this garment the Jewish high-priest bore the names of the twelve tribes of Israel 'for a memorial before the Lord continually', when he went into the tabernacle. So we also have a high-priest who 'hath passed through the heavens' (4¹⁴) and 'entered for us' into 'that which is within the veil', 'having become a high-priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek' (6^{19,20}). Our Lord's entry 'within the veil' signifies three things: (i) the completion of his sacrificial work of making 'purification of sins'; (ii) the completion of his victory over the devil symbolized by the heavenly session at God's right hand; (iii) the beginning of his priestly activity in intercession for us. He entered heaven bearing our names upon his heart; and 'he is able to save to the uttermost them that draw near unto God through him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them' (7²⁵).

Thus the author agrees with St. John in emphasizing the 'finished work' of Christ.² But he also speaks of a present activity which is grounded upon that finished work. His argument, however, turns not only upon the work, but also upon the qualifications of the mediator who performed the work. The mediator is both Son of God and Son of Man. Both titles are necessary to the office of the great high-priest. In chapter 1, therefore, the author exalts our Lord's divine nature and functions, whereas in the next chapter and in succeeding chapters he lays the emphasis upon his human nature and qualifications.³ In chapters 1 and 2 our Lord is contrasted with the angels, who were the mediators of the inferior Mosaic covenant.⁴

of the same text in 1 Cor. 15²⁴⁻²⁸ where, however, the last clause of the text is emphasized as depicting the sequel to the resurrection of Christ.

¹ see references given in notes on p. 374 above, and cp. Exod. 28^{29, 30} with what follows here

² cp. John 17⁴, 19³⁰

³ especially 4¹⁴⁻¹⁶, 5⁷⁻⁹

⁴ In 2¹⁻⁴ the higher revelation given 'through the Lord' and 'confirmed unto us by them that heard' is declared to be worthy of more earnest attention than 'the word spoken through angels'.

Possibly his readers, who were in danger of apostasy, were attracted by notions like those of the Colossian heresy.¹ But in any case this part of his argument strengthened the plea for the superiority of the new covenant as against the old. Moreover, his emphasis upon the eternal sonship (1¹⁻⁹) was vital to his conviction that Christ had perfected our relations with God. Through the Son God brought 'many sons' to glory (2¹⁰).² It was fitting that he who is 'the effulgence' of God's glory 'and the very image of his substance' (1³) should restore to man the image and the glory in and for which he was made.³ So the angels worshipped the Son at his human birth;⁴ and Scriptures testify that he is 'heir of all things' and creator of the world.⁵

In Psalm 8⁽⁷⁾ the author found the phrase: 'thou didst put all things under his feet.' This suggested a connexion with Psalm 110¹ ('until I make thine enemies thy footstool'). The former psalm speaks of man's dignity, as being the crowned king of creation, only a little lower than the angels.⁶ Yet, the author of Hebrews reflects, we do not yet see this high destiny fulfilled in man. We do, however, see Jesus who has for a brief space been put lower than the angels (notwithstanding his superiority to them). This humiliation was only temporary; for he whom we thus contemplate has now been crowned with glory and honour. He has fulfilled the destiny assigned to man in the psalm. That which belonged to the plan of creation has been won; but only because Jesus suffered and died. The sin of man rendered that death indispensable, 'that by the grace of God he might taste death for every man' (2⁶⁻⁹). In chapter 1 the Son has been declared supreme over creation; moreover his enthronement in heaven as priest-king in 1³ already foreshadows his final victory over the powers of evil (1¹³). It is now explained that this exaltation took place in the Man Jesus in fulfilment of God's plan of creation. Man was to be the crowning glory of creation, and Jesus brought it about. Through his sufferings and death he was perfected as 'the pioneer-leader of their salva-

¹ see above, Chapter X

² cp. 7²⁸, Rom. 8²⁹

³ Gen. 1^{26,27}, 1 Cor. 11⁷, Rom. 3²³

⁴ The quotation in 1⁶, a combination of texts from LXX, suggests a knowledge of the story in Luke 2⁸⁻¹⁴

⁵ 1⁷⁻¹⁴. The angels, created by the Heir, minister to his co-heirs (1¹⁴).

⁶ with Ps. 8⁴⁻⁸ cp. Gen. 2¹⁸⁻²⁰

tion' (2¹⁰). Thus 'the world to come' is subjected to the Son, not to the angels (2⁸). The 'firstborn' (1⁶) is the head of both creations, as in Colossians. Moreover this author also follows St. Paul in emphasizing the fact that the exaltation of the incarnate Son is the reward of voluntary humiliation and suffering. The voluntary aspect of the humiliation is emphasized in Hebrews 12², where, as in 2¹⁰, the same word 'pioneer' is used.¹

In the psalm man is called 'son of man' (2⁶).² This is simply a Hebrew variant for 'man'. The Epistle to the Hebrews does not speak of Jesus as 'Son of man' in the eschatological sense of the synoptic gospels. But the phrase in the psalm may well have suggested to the author a contrast with 'Son of God'. If so, we can see here the beginning of the later theological contrast, in which these two phrases indicate the divine and human natures in Christ. Hebrews lies behind the traditional thought that the true mediator between God and man must himself be perfect God and perfect Man. This section of the epistle offers striking resemblances to St. Paul's doctrine of our 'adoption' as well as to the Johannine doctrine that we become God's children in and through God's Son.³ The argument of 2¹⁰ assumes that the 'many sons' can reach glory only through suffering. The author gives abundant illustration of this in chapter 11, following it up in chapter 12 with the example of the 'forerunner' and the exhortation about the chastisement of sons (12¹⁻¹³). Jesus is crowned with glory and honour because he suffered. The author avoids saying that God brought 'the pioneer' or 'founder-leader' to glory. For as the eternal Son he is 'the effulgence' of the Father's glory (1³). None the less, it befitted God in bringing us to glory to make our leader perfect through suffering. We see him crowned with glory because he passed through that probation. The glorious destiny of man can be reached only through suffering. It was worthy of God that he should not exempt 'the Son' from this law.

¹ The conception of our Lord as the ἀρχηγός (i.e. the founder of the Christian polity) who took the lead in bringing Ps. 8 to fulfilment had its analogy in David, who took the lead in bringing Israel to a new unity and supremacy. St. Paul's combination of Ps. 110⁴ with Ps. 8⁶⁽⁷⁾ in 1 Cor. 15 follows v. 23, where the use of τάγμα in connexion with ἀπαρχή puts the firstfruits in the 'front rank' of the human harvest; cp. 'the forerunner' entering in first within the veil in Heb. 6²⁰.

² quoting Ps. 8⁴⁽⁵⁾

³ see above, Chapter VI

For the wonder of the Incarnation lies in the fact that 'he that sanctifieth and they that are being sanctified are all of one' (2¹¹). This mysterious statement can be understood in two senses. Its simplest meaning is summed up in the saying that 'he became what we are, that he might perfect us to be what he is'. He entered our life that we might share his. But the words of 2¹¹ point back behind the Incarnation into the secret counsels of God. The best commentary on these words is contained in Ephesians 1³⁻¹⁰. Our sonship was planned by God in the mould of the divine sonship. All things were created 'in' the firstborn of all creation.¹ So 'the Son' and the 'many sons' form one family. We are his 'brethren' who share his life of filial trust. God has given us to him as 'children' in the home where he is leader. He shares our nature of flesh and blood. In it he crushed the devil's power and freed us from slavish fear. We are lower than his servants the angels. But he came down to our level to take us by the hand and rescue us. It behoved him to become like us. It befitted the Saviour to suffer that he might succour. The qualifications of our high-priest are mercy and faithfulness. He can succour the tempted with his mercy, because he himself was faithful under the ordeal of suffering through temptation (2¹¹⁻¹⁸).

The Son, as high-priest, made expiation for our sins that we might have our trespasses forgiven. But this forgiveness which he procured through suffering means more than the cancelling of debts. It means that we are protected in all trials and temptations, because he has crushed the devil's power and delivered us from the evil one. It means release in the fullest sense,² and therefore 'eternal redemption' (9¹²). The last three clauses of the Lord's Prayer are closely connected. We have the right to pray them confidently because we are one with our sanctifier.³ He has made us 'holy brethren, partakers of a heavenly calling'. We are, therefore, to consider attentively this human Jesus, who was sent on a higher mission than that of Moses, to be the mediator of the Christian 'confession'. For he is no servant in God's house. As the Son he is the Lord of the household to which we belong. He and we together form one house of God, and his faithfulness is at our disposal. We

¹ Col. 1^{15,16}

² see p. 292, n. 3

³ John 17¹⁹

must, therefore, hold fast the confident hope which he has bestowed (3¹⁻⁶).¹ We have our part to play. We must behave as sons in the house where the Son is Lord. This is taken for granted in the Lord's Prayer. Our needs are met by our heavenly Father, because we are his children.² But the full blessings of this family life belong to those who respond to the family atmosphere of fellowship. Forgiveness is for those who have forgiven. Protection and deliverance are for those who have put God first. So we shall have the right to pray that we may not be brought into the supreme trial³ of the eschatological crisis. But for this we may hope only if we have 'continued' with Jesus in his 'temptations'.⁴

After the great thesis of chapter 2, and the conclusion: 'whose house are we' (3⁶), the next section of the epistle carries on the theme of 2¹⁰ (perfection through suffering). But the picture of the Son learning obedience from the things which he suffered (5^{7,8}) alternates with grave warnings about the necessity of our co-operation. For when perfected he became the cause of eternal salvation 'to all who obey him' (5⁹). One of these interludes consists of a homily on Psalm 95 (3⁷⁻⁴¹¹). In contrast to faithful Moses were the unbelieving Israelites who 'tempted' God and were excluded from the promised 'rest' of the Holy Land. So too unbelieving sons may lose their 'rest' in the house of the faithful Son. The 'temptation'⁵ of Israel in the wilderness was that 'tempting' of God which Jesus rejected. It was the opposite of the true probation through trial which the Son of God accepted for himself. There is a play on the double meaning of 'temptation' (the word used also means 'trial'). When we suffer, we are on trial. If we refuse to face the testing trial, that is to 'try' God's patient mercy. But for us to test God's goodness is presumptuous. It is *we* who are to be proved; it is *we* who are on probation, not he. Trial and, if necessary, chastisement⁶ are the portion of sons in their Father's house. Our

¹ cp. 3¹⁴, 6^{18b-20}

² cp. Luke 11¹⁻¹³

³ *πειρασμός*; cp. Rev. 3¹⁰, 2 Pet. 2⁹. To escape that final 'trial' is in one sense the same as to be delivered (*a*) from the evil one (Matt. 6¹³) and (*b*) from 'the wrath to come' (1 Thess. 1¹⁰).

⁴ Luke 22²⁸: *πειρασμοῖς*

⁵ *πειρασμός* in Heb. 3⁸, which quotes Ps. 95 (94)⁸; contrast the next verse with Deut. 8² and Matt. 4^{1,7} (Deut. 6¹⁰)

⁶ cp. 12¹⁻¹³, Ps. 89³⁰⁻³²

Lord accepted both¹ and thereby became perfected as our high-priest (4¹⁵, 5^{9, 10}).

Israel through disobedience in the wilderness forfeited, for that generation, the haven of rest which God had prepared for them. This 'rest' is repeatedly mentioned in the Book of Joshua as having been attained through the conquest of Canaan,² in accordance with the divine oath to the patriarchs.³ Joshua's name means 'saviour', and in Greek becomes 'Jesus'. But the old covenant offers only fleeting shadows of the new. So Joshua's 'rest' was temporal and transitory; whereas the psalm (attributed to David, who lived long after Joshua) speaks as though in the 'to-day' of the writer God's rest is still to be entered, as was the case in the wilderness (4⁶⁻⁸). The 'rest' referred to is God's own sabbath-rest into which God himself entered after the creation.⁴ This is the eternal rest prepared for the people of God, which 'we who believed are entering' (4³). We are at the gates of Paradise; it remains for us to enter and cease from our 'works', as God did (4⁹⁻¹¹). So 'David' bears witness to the eternal rest laid up for believers in Christ. This is, for the author of the epistle, significant. For, whilst Joshua's rest was largely inoperative, the reign of David really did bring a time of national peace, which was enjoyed under Solomon.⁵ Moreover in 2 Samuel 7¹¹ (the messianic covenant) God promises to give David rest from all his enemies.⁶ The sabbath-rest of the new covenant is, therefore, messianic and is won for us by our high-priest after the order of Melchizedek.⁷

But this rest is for those who are partakers in Christ's obedience. So in 4¹¹⁻¹⁶ warning and encouragement are mingled. 'The sword of the Spirit' in Ephesians 6¹⁷, as in Hebrews 4¹², is identified with 'the word of God'; but the word is not personified

¹ cp. Heb. 9²⁸ with Isa. 53 and 1 Pet. 2¹⁰⁻²⁴

² Josh. 11²³, 23¹

³ Josh. 21⁴⁴

⁴ Gen. 2^{2,3}; cp. Ps. 95 (94)¹¹

⁵ *κατάπαυσις*, quoted in Heb. 3¹¹ from Ps. 95 (94)¹¹, is so used only twice besides in LXX: (1) Deut. 12⁹ ('Ye have not come into the rest'); (2) 1 Kings 8⁵⁶ (Solomon blesses God 'to-day, who gave rest to his people'); v. 56b seems to refer back to Deut. 12⁹, and the insertion of 'to-day' (LXX: 56a) connects this verse with v. 7(8) of the psalm. For the connexion of thought see also Acts 7⁴⁴⁻⁴⁷.

⁶ although actually it is already attained in 7¹

⁷ So in the gospels the Son of Man is Lord of the sabbath (Mark 2²⁸) and offers rest to the weary (Matt. 11^{28,29})

in either, as it is in Wisdom 18^{15,16}. It is the revelation of God, proceeding from the Christ in righteous judgement¹ to disclose the secrets of the heart. The close connexion of thought, however, from Hebrews 4¹¹ to 6²⁰ suggests that our high-priest, having himself passed through the fiery ordeal of learning obedience through suffering, has in his human nature been forged into a sword of tempered steel.² In his faithfulness (2¹⁷, 3²) he can pierce through all hollow professions in search of sincerity. Yet he knows the ordeal; so this searcher of hearts (4^{12,13}) is merciful to those who 'hold fast' and 'approach boldly' (4¹⁴⁻¹⁶). Like a surgeon's instrument he reaches the root of our trouble in order to cure it. The obedience which was manifested in the garden of Gethsemane procured our deliverance. The description of the agony in the garden in 5⁷ ('offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears') is sacrificial in tone. The word used for 'offered up' here is used in 10¹² of our Lord's sacrificial death: 'this man having offered up one sacrifice³ for sins for ever sat down on the right hand of God.'

The words last quoted sum up the main argument of the epistle. The 'finished work' of obedience won the eternal rest of the heavenly session. The two *foci* of the argument are here the points of emphasis. The death upon the Cross consummated the Son's obedience.⁴ This emphasis upon the death is clear, not only from the word used in 10¹² for the sacrifice,⁵ but from the preceding passage. The Greek version of Psalm 40 is quoted (10⁵⁻⁷) as an utterance of the Christ. He is represented as saying to God:

Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not,
But a body didst thou prepare for me;
In whole burnt offerings and sacrifices for sin thou hadst no
pleasure:
Then said I, Lo, I am come . . .
To do thy will, O God.

The comment which follows (vv. 8-14) shows (*a*) that the true sacrifice desired by God was the offering of the will, and (*b*) that this offering was made in the body of Christ. The true spiritual

¹ cp. Isa. 11⁴, Rev. 1¹⁶

² For the thought cp. Isa. 49²

³ *thvotav* refers to the slaying of the victim

⁴ as in Phil. 2⁵⁻¹¹

⁵ see above, n. 3 on this page, and cp. 10¹

sacrifice is a consecrated will; but it must be embodied.¹ So God himself prepared a body for his Son (v. 5). His dedicated body² was offered on the Cross, and is here contrasted with the animal victims slain at the great altar of sacrifice, exactly as in Romans 12¹. The whole statement is summarized in verse 10: 'by which will we have been consecrated through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all.'³ This is 'the finished work' of Christ. All else is corollary.

On the Day of Atonement, which in this epistle provides the analogy for Christ's sacrifice, the animal victims were slain by the high priest himself. The whole action was his own. Moreover, whereas in such sacrifices the victim was merely instrumental to the provision of sacrificial blood for ritual uses, this could not be so with Christ. For he, as both priest and victim, offered himself in voluntary death. Here the analogy of the cultus completely fails and becomes positively misleading. On the Jewish Day of Atonement there was only one *focus* of the sacrificial action, namely, the sprinkling of the blood within the veil. But in our Lord's sacrifice the symbolism of this event simply indicates the rich consequences of the death itself. Now of course we must not isolate the death. The author of Hebrews never does. For this writer our Lord's action has two central moments: (1) the death and (2) the entry within the veil.⁴ Further, it has two moments of completion, namely (1) the death and (2) the heavenly session, which showed the death to be a complete victory. Thus the death is central from both points of view,⁵ priestly and kingly. As a sacrifice it is 'finished'⁶ and therefore efficacious in heaven. It has 'perfected for ever them that are being sanctified' (10¹⁴). As a victory it has crushed the enemy and released his victims. So the *sacrificial* victim is enthroned, as in the Apocalypse.

Righteousness has peace for its corollary. Our Lord is king of both (7²). The name and title of Melchizedek sum up the characteristics of the messianic kingdom.⁷ Christ no longer

¹ cp. Rom. 12¹, and above, pp. 19-21

² see above, p. 331

³ cp. also 7²⁷

⁴ The key word rendered: 'once for all' is connected with both the offering of the body (10¹⁰) and the sprinkling of the blood (9¹²).

⁵ cp. 2¹⁴, 9¹⁵⁻¹⁷

⁶ cp. John 19³⁰

⁷ e.g. Ps. 72, Isa. 11⁴⁻⁹

'learns' obedience; he reigns in righteousness. Priesthood and sovereignty are completely fused together in perfect holiness. The sacrifice of righteousness, being complete, has passed into the sphere of attainment which is abidingly secure. Thus the mediator is regnant in his priesthood. For it can neither pass away nor fail. It is eternally efficacious in intercession and sovereign in saving power (7²³⁻²⁸). So again 'the God of peace' 'brought again from the dead the great shepherd of the sheep with the blood of the eternal covenant'.¹ The messianic shepherd of the new Israel reigns in the peace of the risen life, because he shed his blood in death. This corresponds to the Johannine picture of the risen Lord showing his wounds and breathing peace upon his disciples. The peace in which Christ reigns is the sabbath-rest which he has won for his people. But it is no idle peace of inactivity. The Son of Man is Lord of the sabbath and therefore claims to keep it with active works of mercy. For although 'God rested on the seventh day from all his works', the works which 'were finished from the foundation of the world' (4^{3,4}), yet he is the living God, ceaselessly upholding creation and actively fulfilling his purpose in history. So in St. John our Lord justifies his sabbath works with the declaration: 'My Father worketh hitherto and I also work.'² The Jewish objectors rightly saw in these words a claim to deity. The Son is exempt from the Jewish sabbath law, because 'my Father' does not keep it. For the author of Hebrews, of course, the Jewish sabbath belonged to the shadow world of the Mosaic Law. It was only a faint copy of the eternal sabbath-rest mentioned in 4⁹. That rest God already enjoys; and the Son 'perfected for evermore' (7²⁸) has entered it as our forerunner (6²⁰).

The eternal sabbath-rest of the heavenly tabernacle is the peace in which Christ reigns, manifesting his sovereignty in saving power and prevailing intercession. For his priesthood does not pass away (7^{24,25}). So in the heavenly Zion to which we have come 'the blood of sprinkling' 'speaketh better than that of Abel'.³ In the Bible blood spilt in manslaughter cries

¹ 13²⁰; note the active 'working' of the God of peace in v. 21

² John 5¹⁷; on the whole passage see Bernard's notes

³ 12²⁴ and Gen. 4¹⁰; cp. Rev. 6^{9,10}. 'The blood is the life'; so the souls of the martyrs are here conceived to be under the altar of sacrifice in the court

to God for vengeance. So the text means that Jesus, in his human soul, prays for his murderers,¹ among whom we are all included. His death does not call for judgement upon sinners. It is the ground of our reconciliation, the basis of the transformed conditions under which God can forgive us. But these conditions do not operate magically or automatically. They are the presupposition of a ceaseless activity in which our priestly mediator is engaged. He ever liveth to plead for us with the prevailing power of a life once poured out in death, but now present in sacrificial efficacy at the throne of his Father.² Now in this epistle there is contrast, not between heaven and earth, but between the heavenly tabernacle of the new covenant and the earthly tabernacle of Judaism. As in Ephesians, we are already in the heavenly places with Christ. We are 'come unto mount Zion', to Jesus and his 'blood of sprinkling' (12²²⁻²⁴). We have access by the new, living way to the inner shrine of the heavenly sanctuary (10¹⁹⁻²⁵). *There* our life of worship takes place. *There* we co-operate in his ceaseless activity. Moreover in all this there is mystical identity between him and us. We are 'his house'; for the Son and the many sons, the consecrator and the consecrated belong to one order (2¹¹, 3⁶).³ This identity in distinction is perfectly expressed in the words of the risen Lord: 'I ascend unto my Father and your Father.'

His 'my' and 'your' proclaim the truth that the worship of the new covenant draws its whole force and efficacy from his sacrificial approach and entry to his Father's presence. His sacrificed, yet victorious, life is the very substance of our worshipful response to 'our Father'. In this sense we have mystical identity with him; so every Eucharist, as the earthly memorial of his death, has identity with his eternal and sacrificial pleading. His sacrifice fills the Church;⁴ and thus the Church is one with him in his unwearied activity. Although we are not yet come to our final rest, yet we stand at the threshold of the Presence, where within the perfection of his finished work

of the heavenly tabernacle, where their blood drained away after their sacrificial death by martyrdom.

¹ cp. Luke 23³⁴

² The same truth is taught in 1 John 2^{1,2}, where Jesus is the *παράκλητος* because he is the *ἱλασμός*. See above, p. 165.

³ on which see above, pp. 380, 381

⁴ see above, p. 312, on Eph. 5²

there is the energy of ceaseless action surrounded by the untiring praises of creation.¹ Again, because he could say: 'I ascend to my Father', his sacrifice not only fills the worshipping Church on earth; its fragrance also ascends to 'our Father' in heaven.

Such considerations make clear the meaning of Hebrews 13¹⁰⁻¹⁶. 'We have an altar', the heavenly counterpart of the great altar of sacrifice in the court of the Jewish tabernacle.² Our altar is the place where Christ offered his dedicated body once for all and poured out his soul unto death. In the literal and historical sense this 'place' is the Cross once erected on Calvary. But in the heavenly tabernacle all events have eternal significance. The 'place' of the Cross is the place where Christ is in the fulness of his eternal sacrifice. For that very reason the place of Christ's sacrifice is set up in the midst of the Church. Under the old covenant approach to God was piecemeal. The partial fragments of the system could never be integrated.³ Therefore 'outside the camp' of the old order Jesus offered the eternal sacrifice of the New Israel on the Cross of reproach (vv. 10-12). Now though we be 'come to mount Zion', yet we still seek 'the city which is to come'. Our part, then, (in this life) is still at the foot of the Cross, where the reproach of Jesus must be shared (vv. 13, 14). The Cross is set up in the heart of the Church; and we are to resort to it. To come to Jesus means to come to the Cross. Only there can we share in his sacrifice and partake of it.⁴

The Christian altar is the Cross, sprinkled with the blood of Jesus and therefore in integral relation to the immediate presence of God.⁵ There is no longer any separation between the altar of sacrifice and the Holy of Holies.⁶ For the marks of the

¹ John 5¹⁷ and Rev. 4⁸ (in awful contrast to Rev. 14¹¹)

² Exod. 27¹⁻⁸

³ cp. 13^{10,11} with 1¹

⁴ The language of v. 15 shows that the author has in mind the peace-offering. This completes the contrast with the Jewish sacrifices which began in v. 10; for, unlike the Jews, Christians feast upon the victim offered in atonement for their sins. See further below, Additional Note F.

⁵ The ritual acts of Lev. 16^{18,19} are, in the Christian sacrifice, integrated with those of vv. 11-15, immediately preceding; cp. Heb. 9^{21,22}. This point has been strangely overlooked.

⁶ any more than between the sin-offering and the peace-offering; see above, n. 4

nails are displayed upon the risen and ascended Christ. Accordingly the Christian sacraments belong to the New World¹ of Christ's present glory, although *we* are still in this world (12²², 13¹⁴). For a similar reason the Christian altar is also in the Upper Room of the Last Supper, of Easter and of Pentecost. When we repeat the eucharistic words and acts of Jesus we are being consecrated to the sacrifice of the Cross along with the Twelve by him who there consecrated himself to the Cross for our sakes. We share in his consecration and theirs by his own act which sets his sacrifice at the heart of the Church. Finally, as he is king of peace (7²) his sacrifice is our peace-offering. The peace of the Church² lies in the partaking of his sacrifice, and in the self-imparting of the participators to their brethren. So the Common Life and its characteristic activities are integrated into one whole in him at the Christian altar, at the place where the Cross is (vv. 15, 16).

Additional Note F.

'We have an altar'

The well-known text which provides the title of this note occurs in a passage which has received two quite different interpretations (Heb. 13⁸⁻¹⁶). The Cambridge commentators (B. F. Westcott and A. Nairne), following ancient tradition, assume a contrast in v. 10 between Christian privileges and the cultus of the Jewish tabernacle. On the other hand, amongst others, Dr. Moffatt (ICC, pp. 231ff) and, with some hesitation, J. M. Creed (*Expository Times*, vol. 50, pp. 13ff) take *οἱ τῇ σκηνῇ λατρεύοντες* to mean Christian worshippers. On the second view the verse means that whilst Christians have a sacrifice they do not feed upon it. In other words the Eucharist is not for the author of this epistle a sacrificial meal. According to Dr. Moffatt the writer is protesting against a current tendency to sacramental 'realism': 'the *σῶμα Χριστοῦ* of our sacrifice cannot be literally eaten.' In Kittel's *Wörterbuch* the argument becomes even more sweeping. An article on *θυσιαστήριον*, dealing with Heb. 13¹⁰, concludes: 'Only the general thought becomes clear that in the N.T. order of sacrifice there are no sacrificial meals' (KTW, iii, 182³⁹-183³). In another article the same text is held to show that 'probably' all sacrificial meals are 'incompatible with the N.T. order' (KTW, ii, 690³³⁻³⁵). Concerning Dr. Moffatt's thesis (as distinct from his exegesis) Creed wrote: 'It is not inconceivable. . . But it seems to me very unlikely. If the author had this definite aim

¹ Matt. 19²⁸, Luke 22^{20, 30}; see above, pp. 189 ff and pp. 345-350

² John 14²⁷, 20¹⁹⁻²²

in mind, I cannot think he would have expressed himself so allusively and obscurely. Moreover, there is very little reason to suppose that beliefs with regard to the Eucharistic meal were of controversial interest in the first century.' Indeed it would seem likely that such conclusions arise from presuppositions not of the first but of the sixteenth century.

Dr. Moffatt's theory also sets the author of Hebrews in direct opposition to the sacramental teaching of both St. Paul and St. John. As to the former, Dr. Moffatt has himself pointed out that 'Paul does not oppose the table of the Lord to an altar; it is contrasted with the table of demons, which was an altar, because the one as well as the other meant participation in a divine life through sacrifice. . . . The vital difference . . . lay in the character of the offering, not in any distinction between non-sacrificial communion and sacrificial' (*1 Corinthians*, M, p. 138). The controversy reflected in the Johannine and Ignatian writings is not concerned primarily with the Eucharist but with the reality of Christ's 'flesh' which the gnostic spirituality denied. Nevertheless for St. John the doctrine of his prologue (1¹⁴) involved the eucharistic corollary of the discourse (6⁵¹⁻⁵⁸). According to Dr. Moffatt the author of Hebrews occupied an intermediate position between St. John and the gnostics, asserting the Incarnation but indifferent to sacraments. So 13^{8,9} is taken as referring to novel additions to the unchanging truth of Christ 'which mix up his spiritual religion with what is sensuous and material' (ICC, p. 231). There is serious confusion of thought here. Neither in this epistle nor anywhere else in the N.T. is the 'spiritual religion' of Christ set in opposition to the 'sensuous and material' (see above, Ch. I, especially pp. 15-21). The confusion re-appears in Creed's article, where we are told that the thought of Hebrews is 'mystical' or 'idealistic', not 'sacramental'. 'The types of the old law are shadows, and for Christians the shadows have been dissipated by the very image of the truth' (*op. cit.*, p. 14). On the other hand Nairne (*The Epistle of Priesthood*) found in Hebrews a doctrine that the whole Christian dispensation is sacramental iprecisely because 'the shadows have been dissipated by the very image'. This is surely the right conclusion to draw; for that image is to be found in Jesus Christ. In him the invisible realities are made accessible to us through his flesh (2¹⁴, 5⁷, 10²⁰) as they never could be through the Jewish cultus. In his doing of God's will we are sanctified, but only 'through the offering of the *body* of Jesus Christ once for all' (10¹⁰). This text was not emphasized by Nairne; but it would appear to contain the heart of the matter. The blood of Christ shed on the Cross (13¹²) was as material as 'the blood of goats and bulls' (9¹³). Yet the one, being offered 'through eternal spirit', cleanses the conscience; the other availed only for the flesh (9^{13,14}). The truth enunciated in this passage is the very foundation of Christian sacramentalism; it is also in complete accord with the teaching of John 6⁶⁰⁻⁶³ (see below, pp. 431-438, 442-448).

In the light of such considerations we return to Heb. 13⁸⁻¹⁶. The comment on *βρώμασιν* (13⁹) in KTW (i, 641²⁻¹⁶) is excellent so far as it goes. The Christian attitude to food is contrasted with the 'gnostic-ascetic tendency' referred to in 1 Tim. 4³ and in Col. 2^{16, 21ff}. The reference to 'varied and strange teachings' in Heb. 13⁹ suggests some form of religious syncretism rather than the *δικαιώματα σαρκός* of the O.T. referred to in 9¹⁰. Some scholars also connect this with the depreciation of angels in chs. 1 and 2, inferring a Jewish gnostic heresy of the type condemned by St. Paul in Colossians. In any case there are further indications of a contrast with Judaism in 13¹⁰ and in what follows, as in ch. 9 where not only *βρώμασιν* (v. 10) but also *σκηνή* and *λατρεύειν* are prominent. At this point this author's use of words becomes all-important, in particular his use of *σκηνή* and *λατρεύειν* which occur in the key phrase of 13¹⁰.

(1) *σκηνή*. This word is used ten times by the author. In 11⁹ it refers to Abraham dwelling 'in tents'; and a contrast is made between 'the tents' of the patriarchs who are still *in via* and the heavenly city 'which hath the foundations whose architect and maker is God' (v. 10; cp. the use of *χειροποίητος* in 9^{11, 24}). This use of the word is peculiar; yet it fits in well with the prevailing use of the epistle. The tents are transitory man-made devices in contrast to the eternal habitation of which God is the author (cp. 12^{22ff}). Of the nine other occurrences of this word two refer to the heavenly tabernacle (8², 9¹¹) and the remaining seven to the Mosaic tabernacle, unless 13¹⁰ (the disputed instance) is an exception. In both 8² and 9¹¹ the heavenly tabernacle is described with qualifying epithets which contrast it clearly with the Mosaic tabernacle. In 8² it is 'the true tent which the Lord pitched, not man'. This is explained in 8⁵ by reference to 'the pattern' shewn in the mount (Exod. 25⁴⁰). But in 8⁵ the Mosaic tabernacle is referred to without qualification as *τὴν σκηνήν*. The same phenomena meet us in ch. 9. Here the heavenly tabernacle is described as 'the greater and more perfect tent not made with hands' (9¹¹; cp. 11^{9, 10}), whereas in 9²¹ the Mosaic tabernacle is once again referred to as *τὴν σκηνήν* without qualification. There remain four occurrences of *σκηνή*: all are to be found in 9¹⁻⁹ and all refer to the Mosaic tabernacle. In vv. 2, 3 the expression: 'a tent was prepared, the first' refers to the outer tent or Holy Place in contrast to 'a tent which is called Holy of Holies'. Here the two compartments of the tabernacle are described as two tents adjoining one another. In vv. 6-8 these are referred to respectively as 'the first tent' and 'the second'. 'The first tent' in v. 8 has the same meaning as in vv. 2 and 6, i.e. the outer tent or Holy Place. So 'the way into the Holiest Presence was not disclosed so long as the first tent (which foreshadowed the present age) was still standing' (9^{8, 9}M). The New Age in which Christians live was 'foreshadowed' by the outer tent or Holy Place. Clearly also the immediate presence of God in heaven was also foreshadowed by the Holy of Holies. But with the rending of the veil at Christ's death

(10²⁰) this shadow scheme has been dissipated. In the reality to which we belong there is no veil and therefore no separation between a 'first' and a 'second' tent. This interpretation must stand, whatever conclusions be reached with regard to the text and exegesis of 9¹¹.

The epistle, therefore, exhibits a threefold use of the word *σκηνή* in reference to worship: (i) the special use in 9¹⁻¹⁰ distinguishing the two parts of the Mosaic tabernacle; (ii) the careful designation of the heavenly tabernacle in 8² and 9¹¹; (iii) the unqualified designation of the Mosaic tabernacle as *ἡ σκηνή* in 8⁵ and 9²¹. Now in 13¹⁰ we find *τῇ σκηνῇ*, the unqualified designation which belongs to group iii. It is therefore probable that here also the reference is to the Mosaic tabernacle.

(2) *λατρεύειν*. Here again the probabilities point in the same direction. The word occurs six times in this epistle. (a) In two passages it refers to 'the worshipper(s)' absolutely without reference to the object 'served' or 'worshipped' (9⁹, 10³). (b) In two passages the verb is used with dative of the God who is 'worshipped' (9¹⁴, 12²⁸). Finally (c) in two passages it is used with dative of the object 'served' other than the deity (8⁵, 13¹⁰). Once more we have three groups; and here too the difference between the second and the third is crucial. In 12²⁸ M renders: 'worship God acceptably.' In 9¹⁴ 'to serve a living God' describes the effect upon Christian worship (and life) produced by the cleansing power of Christ's sacrifice through his entry into the heavenly tabernacle. In both cases the ordinary biblical use of *λατρεύειν*, with dative of the deity worshipped, is elaborated (*ἐναρέστως*, *ζῶντι*) to bring out the distinctive character of Christian worship. In 9¹⁴ *τὸ λατρεύειν θεῷ ζῶντι* is the climax of the whole passage (9¹⁻¹⁴). For here a contrast is drawn between the Jewish worshipper whose sacrifices had no effect upon his conscience (9⁹; cp. 10²) and the Christian worshipper whose conscience is cleansed by the true sacrifice, and who is therefore able to worship 'a God who is living' (cp. 10³¹).

But if 9¹⁴ looks back to 9⁹, it also looks back further still to 8⁵, where the Jewish worshippers are described as they 'who serve a mere outline and shadow of the heavenlies'. Here in contrast to *θεῷ ζῶντι* we have the dative *ὑποδείγματι καὶ σκιᾷ*, as though the author wished to suggest that the Jewish worship was not a true worship of God, but only a service of the tabernacle. Would he then, after maintaining these careful distinctions between Christian worship of God and Jewish service of the tabernacle, have used the phrase 'they who serve the tabernacle' (13¹⁰) without qualification or explanation to describe Christian worshippers? The answer could scarcely be in doubt, even if we had only his use of *λατρεύειν* to guide us. But we have also his use of *ἡ σκηνή*. The two probabilities converge and multiply one another. If linguistic arguments count for anything, then in the usage of this particular author *οἱ τῇ σκηνῇ λατρεύοντες* can only mean 'those whose worship conforms to the regulations of the Mosaic Law'.

The main source of difficulty in Heb. 13⁸⁻¹⁶ lies not in the sequence of vv. 8-10, but rather in the twofold use which the author makes of the ceremonies connected with the Day of Atonement (Lev. 16). In the first instance novelties concerning 'meats' (whether judaizing, Gentile or syncretistic) were attracting some of his readers; and this suggests to him the thought that the atoning sacrifice of Christ provides a feast to which there is no parallel in the shadow-sacrifices of the old covenant. In elaborating this thought his attention fastens upon another aspect of the facts which he is describing. The bodies of the sacrificial victims, which were not eaten on the day of Atonement, were burnt outside the camp. So Jesus gave his body to destruction outside the gate of the city. In fulfilling this detail of the cultus he also separated himself finally from it. He became an outlaw from the old order, and so must we. Like the patriarchs of 11⁹ we too are pilgrims in this world of shadows and tents, seeking the reality of the coming city. Like Moses we too must bear the reproach of the Messiah (11²⁴⁻²⁶, 13¹³; cp. 10³³). Thus the phrase 'outside the camp' has started a train of thought leading far from novelties concerning 'meats'. But in v. 15 the author returns to his great statement concerning our Christian altar. The phrase *θυσίαν αἰνέσεως* is used in LXX as a technical expression for the peace-offering, that very sacrifice which involved a sacrificial feast for all the worshippers. Here we have another indication that the author had no thought of repudiating the idea of a Christian sacrificial feast. The expression is surely used quite deliberately in order to pick up again the thought already implicit in *ἐχομεν θυσιαστήριον*. The Christian sacrifice includes within itself the truths separately symbolized by sin-offerings and peace-offerings. It includes both atonement and feast. The Eucharist, however, is not simply a ritual meal; it is also an act of worship. Its sacrificial character (*ἀναφέρωμεν θυσίαν*) is expressed not solely in 'breaking bread' but also in praise (*αἰνέσεως*), the true lip-service of which Hosea wrote (Hos. 14²). It is essentially *εὐχαριστία* (1 Cor. 14¹⁶). Finally the Godward aspect of the *κοινωνία* is inseparable from its manward aspect (v. 16), as St. Paul also taught in a similar connexion (1 Cor. 11¹⁷⁻³⁴; see above, pp. 334-345).

The eucharistic reference in Heb. 13 probably does not stand alone. There are two other passages which may be compared. The first of these occurs in 9¹⁵⁻²². All the N.T. accounts of the eucharistic institution contain, at least by implication, some reference to the Mosaic inauguration of the old covenant. So too Heb. 9¹⁵⁻²² contains a detailed reference to that incident (Exod. 24) including a quotation of the sentence upon which our Lord's own words in the upper room were modelled (Exod. 24⁸; cp. Mark 14²⁴). Now it is characteristic of this passage in Heb. 9 that there is a play upon the double meaning of the word *διαθήκη* ('covenant' or 'testament'). Nairne argued that the word is best understood to mean 'covenant' although with a passing reference to 'testament' (*op. cit.*, pp. 358-

366). Dr. Moffatt, who emphasizes the 'testament' idea more strongly (*op. cit.*, pp. 127, 128), yet recognizes that Jesus 'died inaugurating a διαθήκη in words which the writer has in mind (v. 20)'. Moreover, if κληρονομία in v. 15 suggests 'a juristic' reference to a 'testament' or will, the whole language of vv. 15-17 points back strikingly to another inaugural covenant,—that which God made with Abraham. That story records how Abraham, having been *called, received the promise of an inheritance*. All the five words here italicized occur in a parallel connexion in Heb. 9¹⁵. Moreover, the scene in which the covenant with Abraham was inaugurated was one in which the carcasses of animals figure prominently. As described in Gen. 15⁷⁻²¹ it can be fittingly summed up in the words of Heb. 9¹⁷: διαθήκη ἐπὶ νεκροῖς βεβαία. Now the connexion between Abraham, Moses and Christ was fully explored by the author in ch. 7 in connexion with Melchizedek, the type of Christ. Abraham was a link necessary to the proof of Christ's Melchizedekian superiority to the Levitical (that is, the Mosaic) priesthood. The fact that Melchizedek's gifts of bread and wine (Gen. 14¹⁸) are not mentioned in ch. 7 corresponds to the allusiveness of the reference to our Lord's words in the upper room in 9²⁰ through the medium of a quotation from Exod. 24. The obviousness of the eucharistic implication in Gen. 14¹⁸ must have been as familiar to the Christian readers of this epistle as was our Lord's reference to Exod. 24⁸ in his inaugural words in the upper room. Lastly the peace-offerings of Exod. 24⁵ are part of the background in Heb. 9¹⁸⁻²² and give added point to the language of Heb. 13¹⁵ already considered.

The other passage from which eucharistic associations cannot be excluded is, of course, Heb. 10¹⁹⁻²⁵. The two chapters (9, 10) seem to follow the same general pattern. There is first a detailed reference to the Mosaic cultus (9¹⁻¹⁰, 10¹⁻⁴). Then there follows a statement concerning the only true sacrifice (9¹¹⁻¹⁷, 10⁵⁻¹⁸). Finally the scenery of the old covenant is used to suggest the foundation of worship under the new covenant (9¹⁸⁻²⁸, 10¹⁹⁻²⁵). The same pattern may be observed in a more summary form in 13¹⁰⁻¹⁶. The new covenant with its perfect sacrifice admits us to a better worship. The ἐπισυναγωγή of 10²⁵ (see above, pp. 170, 171) can scarcely be other than eucharistic, because in the first age the Eucharist was the only distinctively Christian act of corporate worship (cp. Acts 2⁴² and see Schweitzer, *op. cit.*, p. 254). The argument of the epistle moves from the office of Christ as priest-king (chs. 5-7) to his new covenant and cultus (chs. 8-10). At both stages of the argument the eucharistic implication is barely hidden. In chapter 13 the eucharistic reference becomes explicit.

The Epistle to the Hebrews agrees with the New Testament as a whole in suggesting a close connexion between the Cross, the Upper Room and the Sacraments, all of these being comprised within the heavenly order of which this writer has so much to say. The 'altar'

of Heb. 13¹⁰ has been taken to be the Cross or Christ himself; and the word *θυσιαστήριον* has also been applied to the Christian congregation (or part of it), to the place of worship or of martyrdom, and finally to the Holy Table. In this last use the eucharistic altar is understood to represent Christ himself or Christ in his mystical body. There is a natural interconnexion between all of these ideas if we think of the whole Christian *μυστήριον* in an integral fashion. For Christ *is* the whole Christian cultus; and where his sacrifice is there is the whole Church with all her members. Moreover to be in him is to be where the Cross is, that is, at the heart of his sacrifice. Our Lord's priesthood and sacrifice passed through a series of historical 'moments' upon which follow abiding consequences. The focal point of them all is the Cross, where both priesthood and sacrifice were 'perfected'. To the Cross all the other moments, including that of the Upper Room on Maundy Thursday, and all the abiding consequences, including every Eucharist, are organically related in one whole. The organism of this whole to which and in which all are related is the Body of Christ. Moreover by our Lord's creative words and acts the Bread and Wine of the first Eucharist, which he himself consecrated, were identified with the organism of his whole redemptive action in its sacrificial power. They became *then* the temporal focus of that sacrificial action which in other respects was spread out in time into the future, and which, transcending time, belongs to eternity.

CHAPTER XIII

MY GOD AND YOUR GOD

Our Lord is the mediator of a life shared by him with us. That life which he imparts to us is divine, because it is his. He became man, however, that his divine life might become accessible to us in human form. 'Wherefore it behoved him in all things to be made like unto his brethren.'¹ The 'all things' include all that is proper to our nature; and the obligation 'to be made like unto' us 'in all things' was not imposed upon him from without. On the contrary, it proceeded from his essential nature as the Son. It corresponded perfectly to his being and character. His voluntary humiliation is ungrudging; for he is not ashamed to call us brethren. Now among the 'all things' in which it 'behoved' the Son to be like us the probation of suffering is singled out for special emphasis as necessary with a view to the expiation of our sins. The Incarnation is here, as always in the New Testament, closely related to our need of redemption from sin. It is therefore assumed as self-evident that the priestly purpose of the Incarnation must involve suffering. The 'appropriation' of our nature was a taking by the hand to succour us.² The mission of the Son was a rescue-party in aid of perishing souls. It was by its very nature redemptive, and therefore also sacrificial. For deliverance from evil is always effected by action which is 'consecrated'; and that in two senses of the word.

In the first and primary meaning of the word the Son's mission involved consecration of his will to the Father in willing submission. His mission like that of his apostles³ involved separation, setting apart, dedication to the service of the holy God. Consecration to the holy, however, means conflict with the unholy.⁴ In that conflict victory is won only at a great price. The consecrated action which redeems is therefore inevitably

¹ Heb. 2¹⁷; for what follows see the context (2⁹⁻¹⁸)

² Heb. 2¹⁸; cp. 8⁹. See also Moffatt (ICC) *ad loc.*, TG⁴, p. 240¹ under section *b*, and (for the corresponding noun) MM, p. 240² *ad fin.*

³ Rom. 1¹, John 17¹⁴⁻¹⁹

⁴ John 17¹⁴, Heb. 2¹⁸

expiatory and sacrificial. The best is freely given to ransom good from evil. This, again, involves suffering gladly accepted, and that as part of the dedication to God's holy will. Thus the Son came to do the Father's will in a body divinely prepared for the purpose (Heb. 10⁵⁻¹⁰). It is characteristic of the author of Hebrews to insist that the sufferings of the Son were essential to his 'perfecting' for the office of mediator. This doctrine is, in his teaching, the counterpart of the Johannine doctrine that the Son was glorified on the Cross. The adoration of the Lamb in the Apocalypse corresponds to both of these theological mysteries. Such exaltation of suffering and sacrifice is seen from another aspect when considered in its relation to the Father. 'It became him, for whom are all things, and through whom are all things, . . . to make the author of their salvation perfect through sufferings' (2¹⁰). The obligation of the Son (2¹⁷) is here traced back to a plan which 'became' the Father. God is the source and goal of creation. All that takes place to restore his handiwork must therefore be worthy of him.

The plan which 'became' the Father as creator was the submission of the Saviour to a law of developing perfection.¹ Our Lord passed through a process of development from the innocence of the child to the spiritual maturity proper to the man; and in this process the means through which the 'perfecting' of the sinless took place was suffering. It was fitting that this should be the method of our salvation, because 'he that consecrateth and they that are being consecrated are all of one' (2¹¹). This is a bold application of ideas which were first sketched out by St. Paul, and which later continued to be in the main stream of theological development. In this way of thinking sonship is the ultimate significance of creation, because God's Son is the fountain-head of creation, as also its sphere or site, its ground, and the goal in which it is to be summed up. There is nothing in creation, possible or actual, whose significance is not already in the Son.² The intimate connexion between the eternal Son and the many sons was manifested when he took our nature, as also it will hereafter be consummated in glory. But that connexion is also antecedent to creation, proceeding from the depths of God's predestinating purpose. The whole many-sided plan of

¹ On this subject see *The Incarnate Lord*, pp. 240 ff

² see above, p. 380 and Chapters VI and X

creation and redemption has its source in God's eternal fatherhood. It befits one who is the source of all.

But for this very reason the plan also proceeds from him who is 'the effulgence' of the Father's glory. The matrix of our sonship is the divine sonship, because in the divine *koinonia* there can be no separation between the Father and the Son.¹ Accordingly there is a sense in which the Son and the sons, the consecrator and the consecrated have one origin. Our life comes forth from God in the order of creation. In that 'coming forth' there is a fragmentary reflexion of the eternal coming forth of God's Word or Son. When 1 John, referring to the Christian as a child of God, declares that God's 'seed abideth in him', it is indicated that in each child of God there is, in virtue of the new birth, a seed of the divine sonship,—that sonship which our Lord has in its fulness.² The same doctrine is taught in the fourth gospel, where the seed which is 'the word of God' is sown in men's hearts by the eternal Word himself, so that Sower and seed are one.³ This affinity between us and him, made effectual through the new birth, is to be traced back through creation to its foundation in the eternal sonship, and to its source in the mind of God. Because of this affinity it was fitting that the Son should be the consecrator of the sons who are being consecrated; and the goal of their consecration is that they should share his glory. But how does this affinity between him and us make it fitting that the author of our salvation should be made perfect through sufferings (Heb. 2^{10,11})? This point must now be considered.

The perfecting of the Saviour through sufferings is said to be a plan which befits God in respect of his creativity (2¹⁰). That which is said later about the Saviour himself (v. 17) depends entirely upon this congruity of the plan with the being and character of God as the creator. What is here stated would be difficult to prove; and the author attempts no proof. He speaks with prophetic authority, taking his stand upon the whole bib-

¹ In the language of later theology there is a 'procession' of the creatures from God, which has its ground in the eternal generation of the Son.

² 1 John 3⁹; cp. in 1 John 5¹⁸ the emphatic analogy between: 'he who has been begotten of God' (created sonship) and: 'he who is begotten of God' (eternal sonship)

³ see above, pp. 248, 249

lical revelation, especially the gospel story. 'We see Jesus on account of the suffering of death crowned with glory and honour.' Jesus suffering and glorified is his whole argument. Those who really see this cannot doubt that such a plan was worthy of God. He is addressing a small body of Christians, who are suffering for their faith. Some of them are in danger of apostasy through fear of suffering (6^{4π}, 10^{26π}). The whole world is apparently arrayed against them. Yet if they look into the Scriptures they will find that suffering has always been the lot of the people of God (ch. 11). God is almighty. Yet he did not choose his human agents from the powers of this world, but from those 'who endured as seeing the invisible' (11²⁷). 'By faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God' (11³). But the repository of this faith has always been a 'people of God' whose vocation was fulfilled in suffering. Belief in the God who made the world is bound up with the conviction that 'the reproach of the Christ' is the greatest of all treasures.¹

We cannot believe in the God who made such a world as this unless we interpret the plan of creation in the light of the plan of redemption. This means that we cannot have true Christian faith in God unless we are ready to share Christ's conflict with sin, not shrinking from the suffering which that may involve for us, as it did for him. So the author says boldly that the plan of redemption was worthy of the Creator. The riddle of the universe with its sin and suffering finds its answer on the Cross. He is following in the track of St. Paul's thought about the Wisdom of God revealed in Christ crucified.² He may also have had in mind that apostle's reflexions about the birth-pangs of the new creation and the groaning of the sons of God (Rom. 8^{18π}). In any case he is, in his own way, affirming the fundamental message of the Scriptures of both covenants. In a fallen world creation is restored only through redemption won at a great cost. Vicarious suffering is the vocation of the people of God. Sonship means suffering, because we are free to choose.

¹ The formal statements in 11^{1, 3, 6}, defining faith and its object, are set in the midst of a great argument concerning the probation and sufferings of the people of God. This argument begins at 10²⁶, continues nearly to the end of the epistle, and is Christocentric throughout (11²⁶, 12^{2, 3, 24}, 13^{8, 12, 13, 20}). For a striking parallel cp. the declaration of 2 Macc. 7²⁸ in its relation to its context.

² 1 Cor. 2, on which see above, Chapter IV, pp. 107 ff

Our peace lies in obedience to God's will. Yet that obedience involves conflict with sin. Such a probation of sons was worthy of the Creator; for a world without such a discipline of sons would be a puppet world, or, in the author's own bluff language, a bastard world.¹

Sonship means freedom to respond to fatherhood. It is contrasted with servitude, but not exempt from service. Its service cannot be forced by constraint nor bought for hire;² for it is the willing service of love. From the point of view from which this epistle is written human life is an education of sonship; and the trial or testing of that sonship must inevitably involve suffering. This is what the author means by 'chastisement' (ch. 12). He does not speculate as to why things must be so. He appeals to the facts of human life as we know them, and he finds in them support for his interpretation of God's plan of salvation. Sonship is such that it can come to fulfilment only through this ordeal of suffering willingly accepted. The true response of man to God can be reached in no other way. Human nature is in all ages inclined to say: Why should this ordeal be necessary? Why not have joy without suffering? The author of Hebrews agrees with the fourth evangelist in declaring that there is only one way of answering such a question. 'How sayest thou, The Son of man must be lifted up?' is met with: 'Believe on the light, that ye may become sons of light' (John 12³⁴⁻³⁶). So the question: 'Why must we suffer?'³ is met with these words:

Let us run with endurance the race that is set before us, looking away unto the author and perfecter of our faith—Jesus, who for the joy that was set before him endured the cross, despising the shame, and hath sat down at the right hand of the throne of God.⁴
(Heb. 12^{1,2})

If we look steadfastly to the Cross and its sequel, we shall come to see that 'the reproach of the Christ' is the greatest of all treasures. Through believing on the light we shall become sons of light. In his saying about 'the reproach of the Christ' being

¹ cp. 12¹⁻¹³. The author, however, does not say: 'O happy fault', but: 'O happy remedy'.

² see above, pp. 133, 134

³ The epistle as a whole is an answer to this question. But see especially 10³²⁻³⁹ and 11³³⁻¹²¹³.

⁴ slightly adapted from RV

the 'greater wealth' (11²⁶) this writer touches the Johannine thought that the Son was glorified on the Cross. The same is true of St. Paul in certain moods, as when he says: 'God forbid that I should boast, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ' (Gal. 6¹⁴); or again in the passage which begins: 'What things were gain to me, these have I counted loss for Christ' (Phil. 3⁷⁻¹¹). The Church learnt to find glory on the Cross through reading its meaning in the light of the resurrection. Yet this transfiguration of the Cross did not eliminate its grim reality. The Church could bear to record and to treasure the full details of the passion and death, as they are recorded and treasured in the four gospels, precisely because of the triumphant sequel. So too in the great dogmatic sequence of Philippians 2⁵⁻¹¹ the humiliation is emphasized to the utmost extent, because only so does the full significance of the exaltation appear. Similarly the passage in Hebrews 2 is followed up by the emphatic contrast which the writer makes in 5⁸: 'Son though he was, he learned obedience through the things which he suffered.' The full force of this contrast depends upon the statement of the Son's glory in the preface (1¹⁻⁴). To our finite minds the Incarnation with its issue on the Cross involved an ordeal of sacrificial surrender which is the complete antithesis of the life of divine glory eternally shared by the Son with the Father. This is the very point which the writer to the Hebrews intended to emphasize. So he uses two different words in chapter 2 to describe the appropriateness of redemption through suffering. When he describes the perfecting of the Saviour through sufferings as a method worthy of the Creator, he says that it 'became'¹ the Creator so to act. On the other hand, when he goes on to speak of the Son's co-operation with the plan of redemption, he says that it 'behoved'² the Son 'in all things to be made like unto his brethren'.

What 'became' the Father as creator, 'behoved' the Son as author of our salvation. Moreover, whereas the part of the Creator is active, the corresponding function of the Saviour is stated in the passive form. It became the Creator to perfect 'the pioneer' through sufferings. On the other hand it behoved the Saviour 'to be made like' in order that he might suffer, 'being tempted.' It behoved the Saviour to accept an identification

¹ ἐπεγεν (2¹⁰)

² ὀφείλεν (2¹⁷)

with his brethren so complete as to involve identity with them in the probation of sons through suffering (2^{17,18}). This careful differentiation of language may throw light upon the text which provides a title for the present chapter of this book as well as for the last (John 20¹⁷). But before we consider that saying we must give attention to a phrase used by St. Paul in 2 Corinthians (1³) and repeated twice in later epistles (Eph. 1³, 1 Pet. 1³). In the expression 'the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ' there is certainly implied a unique relationship between the Father and the Son. Yet here, as in the Johannine text, 'the Father' is also 'the God' of our Lord Jesus Christ. Moreover the order of the words suggests an emphasis upon our Lord's human nature. The order of 2 Corinthians 1³ is the reverse of that in John 20¹⁷. 'God and Father' emphasizes the manhood of the Son.

The context of this phrase, on the occasion of its earliest appearance, is also instructive:

Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of mercies and God of all comfort; who comforteth us in all our affliction. (2 Cor. 1^{3,4})

We know him as 'the Father of mercies and God of all comfort' only because he is 'the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ'. The passage goes on to show that this comfort which we receive from God is closely connected with the overflow into us of 'the sufferings of the Christ' (v. 5).¹ The phrase refers to the fulfilment of the Old Testament Scriptures in a suffering Messiah.² The mercy and grace of God flow to us through the human sufferings of his anointed Son. Thus the passage as a whole takes us back to messianic prophecy,—in the first instance to the covenant with David in 2 Samuel 7 and to the messianic psalms directly based upon that covenant. St. Paul's phrase 'God and Father' is best illustrated by the words of Psalm 89²⁶: 'He shall cry unto me, Thou art my father, my God and the rock of my salvation.' But for us the messianic king is also the suffering Servant. When Jesus was anointed with the Spirit at his baptism, the Voice which designated him as the Beloved Son also consecrated him to the mission of the Servant.³ The Beloved Son was now come to his vineyard. But he came like a

¹ On vv. 4-7, see above, pp. 34 ff

² cp. Luke 24²⁸

³ Mark 1¹¹ and parallels

servant to implement the mission of his own servants, the prophets.¹ He came to share the fate of prophets and martyrs who had gone before him. Like his servant Moses he did not stand apart from the sufferings of the people of God.² So 'blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ'.

In Christ we know God to be a gracious and merciful Father. But we know this precisely because he is not only 'the Father' but also 'the God of our Lord Jesus Christ'. We know God as one whom we can bless, because his Son became man and suffered for our salvation. We know it because Jesus fulfilled the words of the psalm: 'He shall cry unto me, Thou art my father, my God and the rock of my salvation.' All the prayers of Jesus were human prayers, addressed by Man to God in fulfilment of man's fundamental obligation, which is to render worship to the Creator who is also Father. So we bless 'the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ' because his Son cried in human words: 'Father, save me from this hour. But for this cause came I unto this hour. Father, glorify thy name' (John 12^{27, 28}). We know God's mercy and can bless him for it, because his Son learned obedience with the cry: 'Abba, Father, all things are possible unto thee; remove this cup from me: howbeit not what I will, but what thou wilt' (Mark 14³⁶). Finally 'blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ', because his Beloved Son addressed to him from the Cross (Mark 15³⁴) the words of another psalm which we count messianic (Ps. 22¹): 'My God, my God, why didst thou forsake me?'

The words of the risen Lord to St. Mary Magdalene express a twofold relationship of the incarnate Son: 'I ascend unto my Father and your Father, and my God and your God.' The relationship of Son to Father is quite distinct from the relationship of man to God. The former relationship belongs to the divine life which our Lord enjoys eternally. The latter belongs to the incarnate state which he assumed for our salvation. The two parts of the saying in John 20¹⁷ bear witness respectively to the two aspects of the Incarnation, the divine and the human. Yet there is here no artificial duality. For the Son, without ceasing to be what he ever is, 'came down' to our level that by taking our nature he might raise it and us to his level. Our nature, without ceasing to be completely human, became the

¹ Mark 12²⁻⁶

² Heb. 11²⁴⁻²⁶; cp. 3¹⁻⁶

medium through which he now holds eternal communion with the 'Father in the divine *koinonia*'. So in St. John's Gospel the most exalted revelations concerning the union of Father and Son are always mediated through our Lord's human mind, that is through the relationship of man to God which he had accepted for himself. This is strikingly illustrated in John 10³⁰⁻³⁶. The Jews seek to stone him for blasphemy because he said: 'I and the Father are one'. Our Lord's defence does not take the form of a claim to deity. That was already implied¹ in the words of 10³⁰, and constituted the ground of the charge (10³³). He appeals to Scripture in support of the exalted language which he used. He found in Scripture such high dignity ascribed to human nature in those 'to whom the word of God came' as to support his own claim to be the Son. The Old Testament used language which in fact foreshadowed the 'deification' of the people of God.² This was the background of the unique consecration and mission of the Son.

We cannot plumb the depths of our Saviour's filial relations with his Father; and therefore such a passage as that just cited must remain beyond our full comprehension. But it seems fair to say that our Lord is here appealing to what may be called an 'incarnational' view of human nature as implicit in the Old Testament revelation. In fact John 10³⁰⁻³⁶ suggests an affinity between 'the Son of God' and those who are 'sons of the Most High',³ which is closely parallel to that suggested by Hebrews 2¹¹. In the fourth gospel, as in the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Son who shares the glory of the Father has also a close affinity with his 'brethren'.⁴ Yet the message which the risen Lord addressed to 'my brethren' contained that clear distinction between 'my' and 'your' which runs through both parts of the saying: 'I ascend unto my Father and your Father, and my God and your God.' In the contrast which our Lord makes between himself and the disciples there is no difference between the two halves of the text. Although he takes his stand

¹ as also in other sayings of Jesus such as those in 5^{17,23} and in 8⁵⁸

² The 'judges' addressed in Ps. 82 were rulers of the nations, according to Briggs (vol. ii *ad loc.*). But *a fortiori* the argument applied to those who were, in a unique sense, 'thy sons' (Wisd. 12²¹).

³ Ps. 82⁶

⁴ cp. 'my brethren' in John 20¹⁷ with the language of Heb. 2^{11-13, 17}

with us on the level of our human nature, yet the redeemer does not include himself among the redeemed. Although he is the Lamb of God, yet the good shepherd does not count himself among the sheep.

He placed himself completely within the creation in submission to the will of the Creator. Yet he *did place himself* there, where he was not before. In thus placing himself within the creation, he did not cease to be the head and source, the sphere, ground and goal of that which he entered so completely. The reason why it behoved him to be in all things made like unto his brethren was a reason which presupposed his eternal distinction from us. The probation of being tempted through suffering qualified him to make expiation for our sins only because he was and ever had been the eternal Son. This distinction between 'my' and 'your' asserts his prerogative in order to secure our salvation. The Son learned obedience to God in the trial of suffering manhood, in order that we might have access to God in the bliss of redeemed manhood. He prostrated himself in agony before his God, in order that we might enter with boldness into the presence of our God. St. Paul's phrase: 'the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ' follows an order which corresponds to the apostle's theology. Our Lord made himself poor and identified himself with the wretchedness of our low estate. He subjected himself to the curse of the manifold tyranny under which we lay. He humbled himself, that we might know the righteous God to be a gracious Father. He became the Servant that we might become sons restored to our home. He became obedient to God's Law that we might have the freedom of forgiven sinners restored to God's grace.

But access to the Father in Christ opens our eyes to the mystery of the redeemer's person as the One Man in whom we have been made new creatures. By partaking of the treasures hidden in his manhood we are brought to adoring recognition of his glory as the Son. This is the path along which St. Paul travelled, a path which leads to a further stage represented in the Epistle to the Hebrews. Here the eternal glory of the Son's divine life is the fundamental presupposition. It raises the problem: Why was it necessary for One who enjoyed eternal fellowship with God to endure suffering and humiliation? Why is suffering necessary at all? The author's answer is really two-

fold: On the one hand suffering accepted as discipline for a noble end can have supreme spiritual value. But secondly this spiritual testing has significance, because it is accepted from God and offered to him. It 'perfects' human nature because it is sacrificial in its essence. God has made man for worshipful response to his Creator. This pattern of creation has deep affinity with the eternal Son because such a response is in its essence filial; it was, therefore, fitting that the Creator should identify his Son with the law of life proper to created sonship. It behoved the Son to become man, that he might bring us to our destiny by fulfilling that destiny himself.

The last stage in the 'argument' appears in the 'Johannine' books with their marked emphasis upon the Lamb of God. Here the conclusion reached in the Epistle to the Hebrews is assumed at the outset. The discipline of suffering is not a problem; it is, rather, a revelation of glory. Hitherto the sequence of inspired thought had been: first humiliation and then triumph; first obedience through suffering, then victory and reward. But the higher the mystery of our Lord's person, the greater is the grandeur of both the condescension and the consequent exaltation. So finally the point is reached where the humiliation and the sufferings are wholly transfigured with glory. It is instructive to notice the use made of the Old Testament in this movement of primitive Christian thought. In St. Paul two convictions lie side by side, but not directly connected. In one passage he identifies our Lord with the passover lamb incidentally, but in a manner which shows that the identification is beyond dispute.¹ Elsewhere he uses language reminiscent of the Servant, either in word or in thought.² These convictions were in harmony with our Lord's own teaching about himself, with his words and acts at the last supper, and with the circumstances and events of his passion and death.

The Servant prophecy is prominent in the apostolic preaching in Acts. But the important quotation in 8^{32,33} shows how inevitable was the eventual identification between the paschal lamb and the Servant.³ The two ideas are united in 1 Peter 1¹⁸⁻²¹.

¹ 1 Cor. 5⁸

² 1 Cor. 15^{3,4}, Rom. 4²⁶; cp. Rom. 5¹⁹, 8³²⁻³⁶, Phil. 2⁷⁻¹¹, and see above, p. 229, n. 2

³ cp. Rom. 8³⁶

For here the reference to the 'precious blood, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot', looks back to 'the sprinkling of the blood' in verse 2. Moreover both 'without blemish' and 'the sprinkling of the blood' refer to Exodus 12 (vv. 5, 7). On the other hand the foreknowledge of Christ as the Lamb 'before the foundation of the world' agrees better with Isaiah 53^{7, 10-12} as interpreted, for example, in Luke 22²² and in Acts 2²³, 3¹³, 4^{27, 28}, 8³²⁻³⁵. The same is true of the reference to the resurrection in 1 Peter 1²¹. Again, in 2²¹⁻²⁵ the Servant-Lamb is also identified with the Shepherd of Israel, whereas in Isaiah 49 the Servant is distinguished from the Shepherd who is God himself.¹ In Hebrews 9²⁸ there is an echo of the Servant prophecy, showing that the identification of our Lord with the Servant-Lamb is taken for granted. Now the conjunction of the paschal lamb with the Servant tended to emphasize the conception of our Lord as the predestined victim suffering in fulfilment of God's purpose and under his hand. This idea of suffering meekly accepted agreed well with a main thought of the Epistle to the Hebrews. But that thought had to be stated differently. For on other grounds the author had selected the sacrifices of the Day of Atonement for special emphasis, as symbolizing the expiatory self-oblation of the eternal Son.

For the writer to the Hebrews our Lord's probation and his self-offering in expiation for sin are the basis of our access to God in worship. All this is taken for granted in the Apocalypse. But here there is an altogether new emphasis upon the conception of the Lamb of God. In this author's portrayal the paschal lamb, the Servant and the Shepherd of Israel are all fused together with the other lines of messianic fulfilment.² In particular it is to be noticed that in chapter 7 (vv. 9-17) the Lamb exercises the functions of Shepherd (v. 17) which in Isaiah 49¹⁰ are assigned to the Lord God; just as in chapter 1 the victorious Son of Man is described in terms which the Old Testament reserves to God.³ This ascription of deity to the paschal victim,

¹ Isa. 49¹⁰: 'He that hath mercy on them shall lead them.' So also in Rev. 7¹⁷ the Servant-Lamb and the Shepherd are significantly one. See below on this page and p. 417 with n. 1.

² In Rev. 1 the picture is drawn from Dan. 7 and Isa. 11; in ch. 5 the Lamb is the Lion of Judah; in 19^{11ff} the messianic king is also the personified Word.

³ cp. Rev. 1^{14, 15} with Dan. 7⁹ and with Ezek. 1²⁴, 43²

who conquers the dragon and his armies,¹ and who is enthroned with God (5⁶, 7¹⁷, 22¹) to receive the worship of all creation (5¹²⁻¹⁴, 7¹⁰), has an effect which prepares the way for the main thesis of the fourth gospel. The sacrificial sufferings of the Saviour are no longer thought of in terms of humiliation or of probation. They are in themselves glorious.

Moreover, another subtle point of difference from the Epistle to the Hebrews is to be noticed. In that epistle suffering is the indispensable preliminary to a 'perfecting' which issues in victorious and effective sovereignty. In the Apocalypse, however, the divine conqueror is still the paschal victim. In the epistle the sufferings are assumed to be a humiliating ordeal which 'behoved' the Son. But when the blood is carried within the veil the priest is enthroned as king. In the Apocalypse, however, the Servant who was led as a lamb to the slaughter remains eternally the victim who suffered and died. He is our passover lamb still, and remains so for evermore. The enthronement and glorification of the sacrificial victim are the focus of the heavenly worship and the foundation of the worshippers' adoring gratitude. In the Epistle to the Hebrews suffering has brought our high-priest to a merciful and gentle ministry on our behalf. But the Apocalypse carries us a stage further. Here the meekness and submissiveness of the Lamb are themselves the substance of victory, sovereignty, power and glory. Moreover the Lamb is the lamp of the divine glory (21^{11, 23}) because his gentle meekness perfectly reflects the heart of God. On the other hand the sharp two-edged sword which proceeds out of his mouth (1¹⁶, 2¹², 19¹⁵) is God's 'unfeigned commandment'.² It is a weapon of judgement, as in Isaiah 11⁴ and in Hebrews 4¹², but directed against false teaching (2^{15, 16}) and against Satan's instruments, the powers of this world (19²¹). The wrath of the Lamb (6¹⁶) is the counterpart of his meekness as the suffering Servant. For he suffered that sin might be utterly consumed by God's holy love.

Lastly in the Apocalypse 'the Lord God almighty and the Lamb' are not only the joint objects of worship in heaven. They are also the only sanctuary in the holy city of the redeemed society (21²²). Ultimately the new creation's sphere of worship

¹ cp. Rev. 12, 17¹⁴, 19¹¹⁻²¹, 20⁷⁻¹⁰

² cp. Wisd. 18^{15, 16}, Eph. 6¹⁷

is none other than God himself who is rendered accessible to his worshippers through the present sacrifice of his Son. The true worship is rendered to God only by those who are in him. This condition is fulfilled where our 'life is hid with Christ in God'.¹ To be in Christ is to be in God. So the tabernacle of God is with men (21³), because the Lamb is in the midst of the throne, 'standing, as though it had been slain' (5⁶). The implication of these passages is the same as in the Pauline doctrine of the Body of Christ. Christ in his sacrificed Body is both the basis of our worship and its substance. He is, therefore, also the sphere of our access to God's presence. We are members of his sacrificial organism, and as such are offered in him, being accepted in his sacrifice. So the martyrs who have suffered death for Christ are, in their outpoured lives, regarded as being one with him in his sacrifice. Their place is beneath the heavenly altar of his sacrifice (6⁹⁻¹¹),² which is where the Cross is.³

The last paragraph suggests that we must beware of exaggerating the difference between the Apocalypse and the epistles. St. Paul exulted over the marks of the Cross in his body.⁴ The Epistle to the Hebrews counts 'the reproach of Christ' to be 'greater wealth'. The First Epistle of St. Peter finds bliss in this reproach, 'for the Spirit of the glory and of God resteth upon you'.⁵ The Church of the New Testament was essentially an army of martyrs whose supreme consolation was the sacrifice of Christ crucified and risen. At any moment they might be called upon to share his sufferings to the uttermost. This situation is reflected in the words of an early Christian hymn:

Faithful is the saying:

For if we died with him, we shall also live with him:

If we endure, we shall also reign with him. (2 Tim. 2^{11,12})

St. John's Gospel begins where the Apocalypse ends. 'The tabernacle of God is with men' because the Word became flesh and made his tabernacle in our human nature. The sanctuary of God is that nature which the incarnate Word has made his own. But here also the Lamb is the lamp of the divine glory.

¹ Col. 3³

² cp. above, p. 385, n. 3

³ cp. Heb. 13¹⁰ and see above, pp. 387, 388, 393, 394

⁴ Gal. 6^{14, 17}; cp. Col. 1²⁴, Phil. 2¹⁷

⁵ 1 Pet. 4¹⁴; see above, pp. 37ff

The tabernacle of our nature which the Word has taken to himself became by that very fact the dwelling-place of God's Presence; for it is the shrine of the 'glory as of the Only-begotten from the Father'. Moreover in the gospel, as in the Apocalypse, the Lamb is both the paschal victim and the sanctuary. At our Lord's first appearance in the narrative he is greeted at once by the Baptist as 'the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world' (1^{29,36}).¹ Here (as in the Apocalypse) 'the Lamb which God provides' is a title for the suffering Messiah who fulfils the whole of the Old Testament in its sacrificial aspect. Our Lord in his incarnate life, sacrificially offered upon the Cross, is the divine-human victim in and through whom we have communion with the Father; and that because he has made expiation for our sins.² The Lamb which God provides is his only Son.³ Accordingly, whereas the tabernacling of the Word in human nature made the divine glory accessible to man, that glory was most fully revealed on the Cross, because there the sin of the world was taken away. In other words it is the Lamb, the willing victim, who is the lamp or torch bearing aloft the flame of divine love. The conquest of sin through sacrifice is the supreme unveiling of love and the chief work of love. The Lamb of God bearing the sin of the world away, as he is ever doing, is the Only Son rendering back to the Father that glory which he eternally receives.

God's provision of his Son as the sin-bearing Lamb was 'foreknown before the foundation of the world'. The Servant-Lamb was 'delivered up by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God'.⁴ In John 1²⁹⁻³⁶ the Baptist is represented as recognizing in Jesus the fulfilment of the whole pre-ordained purpose of God at the moment when he, the forerunner, initiated the Messiah into his mission. In his baptism Jesus was sealed as the divinely-provided victim. The necessity of the sacrifice is insisted upon in 3¹⁴ and traced to its cause in 3¹⁶. It

¹ On the title and the text as a whole Bernard's notes should be consulted (pp. 43-47). On this passage (1²⁹⁻³⁶) see also above, pp. 216-218. The context here indicates the Servant (e.g. the refs. to Isa. 40³ and 42¹ respectively in 1²³ and 1^{32, 33}), whereas 19³¹⁻³⁷ (as in the Apocalypse) indicates the paschal victim, but not exclusively (19³⁷); cp. Rev. 7¹⁷, on which see below, pp. 415 ff and n. 1 on p. 417.

² cp. 1 John 1³⁻⁷, and pp. 156-171 above

³ Gen. 22^{8, 12}

⁴ see above, p. 406

was God's love for the world that caused him to give his Only Son to death. But in this as in all things there is between the Father and the Son one mind, one love, one glory (cp. 17¹⁻⁵). The Son's sacrifice is completely voluntary, although in accordance with the Father's command. He gladly obeys the command; and his act, which issues in death and victory over death, is the historical ground of the Father's love for the incarnate Son (10^{17,18}). So the Father rejoices in the Son's sacrifice; and that sacrifice is, in turn, the Son's offering of love to the Father. The Son's sacrifice for the sin of the world is thus the medium of that eternal exchange of love which is the heart of the divine *koinonia*. At this point we can see how it is that the Lamb is both sacrifice and sanctuary. A sanctuary exists for sacrifice and communion. The sacrifice of the Lamb is the expression in time and history of that eternal communion which is the common life of the Father and the Son. In that sacrifice is concentrated, through it is refracted, the glory of divine love in its eternal interchanges.

Now the sacrifice was offered to take away the sin of the world, because God loves the world. It is the means through which all who will may have eternal life. The object of the Son's mission was 'that the world might be saved through him' (3¹⁷). Salvation is 'through him', that is, through his sacrifice. But everyone who believes on the Son has eternal life 'in him', that is, in the divine-human victim (3¹⁵)¹. Thus we have communion with the Father in him who is the sacrifice. The sacrificed Lamb of God is not only the ground of our communion with God, but also the sphere in which that communion takes place, in other words the sanctuary. This brings us back to the saying in 2²¹: 'He was speaking about the temple of his body.'² Only when the Lord was raised from the dead did the disciples understand the saying. We are members of the Body in which Jesus died and rose again. The organism to which we belong is sacrificial. For it is marked with the wounds of the crucifixion. Yet those wounds now belong to the glory of the risen life. The sanctuary in which we worship is the body of the paschal victim, 'standing, as though it had been slain,' once dead, yet 'alive for evermore'.³

¹ cp. 1 John 5^{11,20}

² see above, pp. 317-319

³ Rev. 5⁶, 1¹⁸

The true sphere of our worship is nothing less than the life of God himself. To this life we have access in the divine Son because he became the human victim. Placing himself on the level of our race, he became the perfect sacrifice which is the substance of all true worship. In virtue of his Incarnation and impending death he was able to say: 'The hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and truth: for such doth the Father seek to be his worshippers.' Because God is spirit he can accept only the worship which is grounded in complete spiritual reality (4^{23,24}). But such was the worship offered by the Son. The hour had already struck. For the incarnate Son himself was already worshipping the Father with that worship which the Father desired. Through his Son the Father was even then seeking in a world of sinners for those genuine worshippers, whose worship could be true and spiritual only in the Son. This passage is of cardinal importance for the understanding of the fourth gospel. The statement in verse 24 contains two definitions: (1) God is Spirit; (2) consequently he must be worshipped 'in Spirit and Truth'. The word 'spirit' looks back to the earlier part of the conversation, where our Lord offers the gift of 'living water' (4¹⁰⁻¹⁵). From 7³⁷⁻³⁹ we know that this living water is to be identified with the Holy Spirit.¹ Now in 16¹³⁻¹⁵ the Holy Spirit is called 'the Spirit of the truth':

When he, the Spirit of the truth², is come, he shall guide you into all the truth. . . . He shall glorify me: for he shall take of mine, and shall declare it unto you. All things whatsoever the Father hath are mine: therefore said I, that he taketh of mine, and shall declare it unto you.

The word rendered 'guide' in verse 13 means 'to act as a guide or leader who shows the way'.³ The Holy Spirit shows 'the way' to 'the truth'. Now in 14⁶ our Lord says: 'I am the Way and the Truth and the Life'. Accordingly the Spirit glorifies Jesus by revealing him to us as the only way by which we can come to the Father. As he leads us along that way he initiates us into 'the Truth' 'as truth is in Jesus'.⁴ The true worship,

¹ see above, p. 319f

² The omission of the article here by RV is unfortunate.

³ ὁδηγῆσαι. For fuller details see Bernard *ad loc.* (p. 510), and on 15²⁶ (pp. 498, 499).

⁴ Eph. 4²¹; cp. above, p. 311

therefore, can be offered only 'in spirit and truth'. The substance of that worship is 'the way' of access to the Father which is embodied in Jesus. As wayfarers along that way we are identified with Jesus and included in him. Moreover we can know 'the Truth' only by walking along 'the Way'; and this we can do only 'in spirit', that is, through the activity of the Holy Spirit. We cannot worship 'in truth' except in Jesus, who is 'the Truth'; and we cannot know the truth as it is in him, unless the Holy Spirit takes the things of Jesus and shows them to us. The genuine worship which the Father 'seeks' in his worshippers is nothing else than the sacrificial response of Jesus. This response was consummated in terms of our human nature, when the Lamb of God died on the Cross to take away the sin of the world.

The way to God for us is nothing else than the sacrificial offering of the Lamb whom God provides. The truth about God is finally revealed in that offering; and in the truth so revealed the Only Son is glorified as the Lamb of God. But, as for St. Paul the love of God is manifested in two ways, (1) on the Cross and (2) in the heart,¹ so also for St. John God's Only Son is 'glorified' in those same two ways. Of the glory on the Cross enough was said in Chapter VIII.² In 16^{14,15} the evangelist records our Lord's words concerning his glorification by the Paraclete. This work of the Paraclete certainly takes place 'in the heart'. Indeed on that last night it had already begun. For our Lord was able to say: 'he abideth with you and is in you' (14¹⁷). The powers of the New Age were already at work, and the disciples were already branches of the genuine Vine. But if we are to understand rightly the relationship of the Holy Spirit to the Only Son in this gospel we must turn back to the evangelist's account of our Lord's baptism and to his record of the Baptist's witness concerning the Lamb of God (1²⁹⁻³⁶).³ The four gospels agree essentially in their treatment of the baptism. All lines of messianic prophecy meet in him upon whom the Spirit descends. The peculiarity of the Johannine account lies, first, in the fact that the inward significance of the event is explained by the Baptist, and secondly in his designation of Jesus as the Lamb of God.

¹ see above, Chapter IV

² see above, pp. 246-252

³ The reader is here reminded of the earlier treatment of this subject in Chapter VII (pp. 216-218)

The narrative of the fourth gospel begins with the witness of the Baptist to Jesus. The evangelist evidently attached great importance to this witness, as he introduces it very abruptly (twice over) into the prologue (1^{6-8,15}). The witness of John concerning the Lamb of God also has its parallel in the witness of Moses concerning the brazen serpent (3¹⁴). In both cases these authorities are brought forward to testify concerning the meaning of our Lord's death on the Cross. It is also to be noticed that in both cases these 'witnesses' are first mentioned in a manner which indicates their inferiority to the Only Son (1^{8,15,17}). The story of the fourth gospel sets the glory of the Only Son on a Mount of Transfiguration with Moses and the new Elijah (the greatest of the prophets) on either hand to bear witness to that glory. But the Baptist comes first; for he was not only the greatest, but also the last of the prophets. As such he was also an eye-witness of the glory. In his person therefore the whole prophetic choir become, in a sense, eye-witnesses, just as in 1¹⁴ all Christians are, in a sense, identified with the original eye-witnesses.¹ Thus we may say that in this gospel the two Johns, the forerunner and the beloved disciple, are put forward as joint-witnesses of the glory on behalf of the Bride, the Israel of God, old and new.²

In the evangelist's account of John's witness the conviction that Jesus is 'the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world' is traced back to what the Baptist saw at the time of the baptism. The Spirit descending as a dove from heaven rested upon Jesus. This sign told the witness that Jesus was the messianic Son, anointed with the Spirit in accordance with prophecy.³ But for the evangelist the witness of the Baptist includes the full implications of the event, as already interpreted by the other gospels. The Messiah is Son *and* Servant. So the Spirit-anointed Jesus is the Lamb whom God provided to take away the world's sin.⁴ Jesus is the Lamb, because he is anointed

¹ see above, pp. 316, 317

² cp. 1⁶⁻⁸ in the prologue with 21²⁴ in the epilogue

³ 1³²⁻³⁴; cp. Isa. 11^{1,2}. In current thought the Messiah was also pre-existent; so this formed part of the Baptist's witness (1^{15,30}) independently of the baptism.

⁴ The speculations concerning the literary history of the title ('the Lamb of God') in 1²⁹ (Bernard, pp. 45, 46) cannot affect the theological significance of its use by the evangelist.

with the Spirit. The Lamb of God is the supreme agent of God's saving purpose. He sums up in himself the functions of all God's anointed agents. He proclaims the good news of his coming death for the sin of the world by the very fact of his anointing with the Spirit at his baptism.¹ Now in John 1^{29ff} the Baptist bears witness to this truth, *because he has learnt it from the Spirit*. The glorification of Jesus as the Lamb begins with the descent of the Spirit from heaven at the baptism. The descent of the heavenly dove reveals to John the identity of the Only Son and therefore also the glory of the Lamb provided by God. It may well be that the evangelist has in view here a 'docetic' explanation of the dove's descent. If so he refutes it by putting the true explanation into the mouth of his primary human witness. But the human witness speaks with authority because he has learnt the truth from a divine witness, none other than the Spirit of God himself. 'He shall glorify me; for he shall take of mine, and shall declare it unto you.'

The initiation by act and word which took place in the upper room provides a clue to the meaning of the fourth gospel as a whole.² The words of 16¹⁸⁻¹⁵ lay down a truth which received its full application after the resurrection, but which began to be true in principle from our Lord's baptism onwards. The historical glorification began with the witness of 'the Spirit' and 'the water' at the river Jordan. It was consummated with the witness of 'the blood' and 'the water' on the hill of Calvary (19³⁴).³ The mystical glorification, on the other hand, belongs to the Christian life. It is made possible for each of us, because all have received 'the anointing'.⁴ The true worship of John 4^{23,24} is made possible for every Christian through the anointing with the Spirit which we received at our initiation. We were then made partakers in the vocation and mission of the Lamb of God, because we stood with him in the waters of the new creation and received in him the dower of the heavenly dove descending to rest upon our

¹ Isa. 61^{1ff}. The significance of 'anointing with the Spirit' has been considered in previous chapters; see especially pp. 138-142, 160-162, and 272, 273 above.

² as well as to the meaning of the synoptic gospels; see above, Chapter VIII

³ see 1 John 5⁶⁻⁸; cp. also pp. 420ff. 'Docetic' explanations denied the Incarnation of God's Son in true manhood of flesh and blood.

⁴ 1 John 2^{20,27}

heads. The mission of the Lamb to be the appointed sacrifice wherein all true worship is offered to the Father was solemnly attested by the Spirit to the witnesses of both covenants. The Baptist, as representative of the prophetic choir, is made eye-witness of the Spirit's testimony confirming the truth of all that the prophets wrote as fulfilled in Jesus. Present with him were a group of his own disciples. From that time onwards they became eye-witnesses of the new covenant; and this took place through the witness of the Baptist in dependence upon the testimony of the Spirit.

The voice of the elder Israel in the person of John, expressly taught by the Spirit, declares the meaning of the old covenant as fulfilled in Jesus. The finger of prophecy points to the Lamb of God under the guidance of the Spirit. So the disciples under this authoritative guidance pass over into the new Israel and begin to be initiated by the Lamb of God into the true worship, which henceforth can be offered only in him. The Johannine interpretation of these incidents indicates that the true worship belongs to the new creation¹ which is to be found only in Jesus, the human victim anointed with the Spirit for his sacrifice. The finger of prophecy could, under the guidance of the Spirit, indicate the truth. But its representatives, in themselves, belonged to the old creation. Those who belong to the new creation in virtue of the Spirit's anointing can understand the significance of the prophet's witness better than he. For they belong to that to which he can only point. They, therefore, can legitimately read back the full truth about the Lamb of God into the Old Testament Scriptures and interpret the message of the prophet to himself. This is in effect what the evangelist does in his interpretation of the Baptist's witness. For that very reason his interpretation is fundamentally true. The Lamb of God is glorified by the Spirit out of the mouths of Old Testament writers who did not know Jesus 'after the flesh'.²

But if the Spirit leads men to the Lamb of God, it is equally true that the Lamb of God leads men to the Spirit. To this complementary truth we must now turn. St. Paul told the

¹ see above, pp. 215-219

² cp. 1 Pet. 1¹⁰⁻¹². So too the Baptist did not claim to be the new Elijah (John 1²¹); whereas our Lord affirmed the claim on his behalf (Mark 9^{12,13}, Matt. 11^{9,10}, Luke 7^{26,27}).

Corinthians that 'our fathers . . . were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea; and did all eat the same spiritual meat; and did all drink the same spiritual drink' (1 Cor. 10^{1ff}). Moses led them through the waters of redemption to the spiritual refreshment of the redeemed. But in the new creation 'they sing the song of Moses the servant of God, *and* the song of the Lamb' (Rev. 15³)—the Servant of whom Moses was only a type. The paschal lamb of the new covenant takes the place of Moses; for Jesus is both Lamb and Servant. So 'they shall hunger no more, neither thirst any more . . . for the Lamb which is in the midst of the throne shall be their shepherd, and shall guide¹ them unto fountains of waters of life.'² Only he who was anointed with the Spirit can bestow the Spirit. Because Jesus was already the Lamb of God, the anointed Servant, he was able during his earthly life to promise the gift of the Spirit to mankind (John 4¹⁰⁻¹⁵, 7³⁷⁻³⁹). This gift he can bestow with an unfailing supply (3^{34, 35}). We all receive of his fulness; and the grace which we receive corresponds to the grace of which he is full (1^{16, 14}). But although he could promise the water of life during the days of his flesh he could bestow that gift only after he was glorified (7³⁹, 19³⁰, 20²²).

The comment of the evangelist in 7³⁹ makes clear one reason why the gift of the Spirit could be bestowed only after Jesus was glorified: 'This spake he of the Spirit, which they that believed on him were to receive.' The Spirit is bestowed only upon those who can be called believers in Jesus. The teaching about the new birth 'of water and the Spirit' (3⁵) presupposes the earlier statement of 1¹²⁻¹⁴. Faith in the incarnate Word is presupposed in Christian initiation. But the comment in 7³⁹ proceeds: 'The Spirit was not yet given; because Jesus was not yet glorified.' The Spirit is given to those who believe in the incarnate Word, because through the Incarnation his glory was made accessible to human vision and faith, 'the glory as of the Only-begotten Son from the Father.' We cannot have the life which the Spirit gives unless we behold the glory of the Son which belongs to the divine *koinonia* (1¹⁴; cp. 6⁴⁰). We cannot 'see the Father' (1¹⁸, 6⁴⁶). Yet 'he that hath seen me hath seen the Father' (14⁹). Thus already it is clear that participation in the Spirit implies access to the uncreated light of the glory which

¹ ὁδηγήσει² Rev. 7¹⁷; cp. Isa. 49¹⁰, 40¹¹ and see next note.

the Son receives from the Father. But before we reach the waters of new birth in 3⁵, it has already been made plain that those waters of the new creation have been consecrated by the Lamb of God (1²⁹⁻³⁶). The Son was designated by the Spirit to be the Lamb of God; and the gift of the Spirit to us is now seen to depend upon the fact that the Son became the Lamb of God. The gift is for those who believe in the glory of the Son; and that glory was fully manifested only when the Lamb was offered on the Cross. Until he was fully glorified as the appointed paschal victim we could not see the glory in its full meaning and therefore could not receive the Spirit.

It is the Lamb that has been slain who has the right of the divine Shepherd to lead men to the living waters of the Spirit.¹ This picture of the victim who is also the leader, in the Apocalypse, throws light on that other twofold picture of the door and the shepherd in the gospel (10^{1-18, 26-30}). Jesus is the Door (10⁷⁻⁹) because he is the Way to God (14⁶). The meaning of both pictures (the Door and the Way) is that he is the sacrificial victim through whom we receive the full knowledge of God's love, and through whom in turn we come to the abundant life (10^{10, 28}) which consists in communion and worship. But we come into these pastures through the leadership of Jesus. For he himself has entered, by that door which consists of his own sacrifice, into the pastoral office of the Good Shepherd.² He is qualified for that office by his willing surrender of life. In fact his goodness is defined by his self-giving (10¹¹), which in turn is the very basis of his leadership. The sheep trust and follow him, because 'they know his voice' (10⁴). Moreover this knowledge is mutual. If he knows their needs, they know his protecting care as manifested supremely in his surrender of

¹ Rev. 7¹⁷ epitomizes the 'Lamb of God' Christology, which is, perhaps, the main 'Johannine' link between the two covenants. So with his quotation of Isa. 40³ in 1²³, from the lips of the Baptist, the evangelist strikes a key-note of his gospel. For in the Second Isaiah we find the following sequence: The voice in the wilderness (40³) proclaims that the divine Shepherd (40¹¹) will open the waters (41¹⁸) to his flock (49¹⁰) through his Servant (41⁸⁻²⁰, 49¹⁻¹³) who is the sin-bearing Lamb (53).

² In 10¹⁻⁶ the door is the entrance to the Jewish sheep-fold and also the way out of it into the new pastures. Jesus has 'the key of David' (Rev. 3^{7, 8}), the key which unlocks the door of the old covenant and opens the way into the new.

life on their behalf. Finally this mutual knowledge on the basis of his sacrifice is strictly parallel to the mutual knowledge of the Father and the Son. The common life of Shepherd and flock is of one pattern with the common life of Father and Son; and the link between the two forms of the *koinonia*, the divine and the human, is the sacrifice of the Good Shepherd (vv. 14, 15; cp. vv. 27, 28). Ultimately the security of the sheep depends upon, and is safeguarded by, the perfect union of Father and Son and the sovereign power of God (vv. 29, 30).

Our Lord's sacrifice is the basis of his leadership into the pastures of the new life. This theme is continued in another form in the upper room. There he speaks frequently of his imminent journey to the Father (16^{5,17,28}; cp. 13^{33,36}, 14²⁸). The Good Shepherd goes before the flock to death. This is necessary, that he may 'go and prepare a place' for them, travelling to the destination which they know and by the way which they know (14²⁻⁶). This journey whither they 'cannot follow now' (13³⁶) should be a matter for their rejoicing; for it means going to the Father 'who is greater than I' (14²⁸). The incarnate Son looks upward from the lowliness of his manhood to the greater resources of the divine life in his Father. This saying is further explained by two others: (1) the 'going' has a sequel in the 'coming' of his return. The 'going' to the Father involves laying down his life in death. But this will have a glorious sequel. Death is the indispensable condition of fruitful life (12²⁴). By going before them to death he will come again with all the resources of his risen power to receive them into a share in his fulness of life (14³). (2) This 'going' is not a matter for sorrow, because without it the Paraclete will not come. The leadership of Jesus shows them the way through death to life; and this involves separation. But it opens the way for another leadership, the leadership of the Holy Spirit. When *he* is come he will lead them into all the truth through the mystical glorification of Jesus in the heart (16⁵⁻¹⁵).¹

Thus the Lamb of God leads men through the glory of his sacrifice to the pastures of new life and the resources of the Spirit; whereas the Spirit in turn leads men again to the glory of the Lamb as the victim slain, yet alive for evermore. More-

¹ These two consequences of his 'going to the Father' will result in their doing greater works than those of the incarnate life on earth (14¹²).

over, in glorifying the Son the Spirit glorifies the Father; for 'all things whatsoever the Father hath are mine: therefore said I, that he taketh of mine, and shall declare it unto you.' All the riches of the divine life, belonging to the Father, belong also to the Son. In 'showing' us what belongs to the Son the Spirit also 'shows' what belongs to the Father (16^{14,15}). This teaching explains the fundamental passage about the divine indwelling (14¹⁵⁻²⁴). The gift of the Paraclete after the Resurrection will make accessible to the disciples a new form of life, which will depend upon the risen life of Jesus. Our Lord speaks of these things as present realities,—as indeed they were, both in the mind of the speaker and in the eternal 'now' of the fourth gospel. 'Because I live ye shall live also'; 'he abideth with you and is in you'¹ (14^{19,17}). Yet these present realities also belong to 'that day' when 'ye shall know'. The present dawn leads to the eternal day (v. 20).

In this passage all the teaching of St. Paul about being 'in Christ' with its counterpart: 'Christ in you,' is carried to its logical goal. Clearly, as with St. Paul, so here the indwelling of the Son (and therefore also of the Father) depends upon the presence of the Holy Spirit. Because 'he abideth with you and is in you', therefore 'I will not leave you orphans, I come to you'. The human love which is the condition of the divine indwelling is a response to the love of God in Christ (1 John 4⁷⁻¹⁰). This response in turn is the work of the Spirit through the mystical glorification of Jesus. Finally, in 1 John we are twice told that we know the facts of the divine indwelling through the gift of the Spirit (3²⁴, 4¹³). The same epistle tells us that the divine indwelling is conditioned by the mutual love of Christians towards one another (4¹²; cp. v. 16). The life of God is a life in which love is common to the Persons who share it. Of this common life of love we partake through the gift of the Spirit. Thus the whole of the divine *koinonia* is present in each disciple and in the community to which he belongs. The Church is the community in which the interchanges of love belonging to the divine life are reproduced in human form (cp. 1³). The medium through which this divine-human sharing takes place is the sacrificial organism of the divine-human life. This is none other than the risen Lord himself. 'Because I live, ye shall live also.'

¹ The better reading in 14¹⁷ is ἐστίν. See further, p. 437 and note 3.

On his first appearance in the narrative our Lord was acknowledged by the Baptist as 'the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world'. In the last scene of his mortal life on earth he is again acknowledged to be the Lamb of God. As the former acknowledgement was made by the representative of Jewish prophecy, so the latter was made by the unwitting representatives of Roman law and Gentile rule. The facts are set forth in chapter 19 immediately after the death of Jesus (vv. 31-37). In this narrative two points are made: (1) Jesus is the passover lamb of the new covenant, whose death coincided with the slaying of the passover lambs of the old covenant. No bone of the paschal lamb might be broken.¹ So no bone of the Lord's body is broken. His sacred body remains whole and entire, in spite of death. (2) With his spear a soldier 'pierced his side, and straightway there came out blood and water'. The eye-witness who was present when John pointed to the Lamb of God was present again at the Cross. He testifies to the truth of 'these things' by which the Scriptures were fulfilled. Jesus is the paschal lamb of the New Law; through his sprinkled blood we are saved from destruction in the house of bondage. But he also fulfilled the prophecies about his death. 'They shall look on him whom they pierced' (Zech. 12¹⁰). He is the predestined Servant, led as a lamb to the slaughter and bearing away the sin of the world.

It is significant that in the passage from which this second quotation comes we read a few lines later these words: 'In that day there shall be a fountain opened . . . for sin and for uncleanness' (13¹). The fountain was opened by the soldier's spear. Out of our Saviour's side there came the cleansing stream of blood and water. To this incident reference is made in 1 John 5⁶⁻⁸. Here again it is possible that, as in the case of the dove at the baptism, the evangelist is concerned to refute docetic phantasies by insisting on the reality of our Lord's human blood-stream—'not in the water only, but in the water and in the blood'.² He endured for our sakes not only the baptism of water which sealed him for death, but also the baptism of blood in which his death was actually effected for our salvation.

¹ Exod. 12⁴⁶, Num. 9¹², John 19³⁶

² 1 John 5⁶; this is the comment of the epistle on the thesis affirmed by the evangelist through his portrayal of the incident; cp. p. 414, with n. 3

There was nothing unreal about the dying of this human victim. Because his sacrifice was a real historical event, he ever takes away the world's sin through the out-pouring of his life in libation to God.

But to get the full meaning of this incident we must bring it into connexion once more with the gospel as a whole. Three times does this evangelist refer to the feast of the passover at which the paschal lambs were slain and eaten. The first occasion is in connexion with our Lord's cleansing of the temple in chapter 2.¹ Jesus uttered a doom over the unclean temple of apostate Judaism and prophesied the death and resurrection of his own body, the new sanctuary. By sharing his death and resurrection in the waters of baptism we are admitted into that new sanctuary, the risen body of the Lamb. We are cleansed by the waters of the new creation, which were consecrated by the Lamb of God with his own life-stream poured out in death. So, as water flowed from his body on the Cross, the waters of the Spirit shall flow from our bodies, as from Ezekiel's temple.² Those who are cleansed by him become part of the sanctuary from which cleansing and healing waters flow to the ends of the earth. The second occasion on which the passover is mentioned is at the beginning of the incidents leading up to the eucharistic discourse.³ As in chapter 2, the reference to the festival of redemption here has, perhaps, both a positive and a negative significance. Some of the Galileans who came up to assist at another passover-sacrifice in the apostate temple may have had their share in compassing the death of Jesus. So, thirdly, the passover is prominent in the passion narrative, especially in chapters 18 and 19:

Now it was the Preparation of the passover.⁴ . . . And he saith unto the Jews, Behold, your King! They therefore cried out, Away with him, away with him, crucify him. (John 19^{14, 15})

There is Johannine irony in the repeated references to the Jewish passover and its 'preparation'.⁵ When Jesus was brought before Pilate, the Jewish authorities were careful to

¹ 2^{13, 23}; see above, pp. 317 ff

² 7^{37, 38}; see above, pp. 319 f

³ 6⁴; see above, p. 333

⁴ cp. 12¹, 18²⁸, 19^{31, 42}

⁵ as also in the question of the Gentile governor: 'Shall I crucify your king?' (19¹⁵)

preserve themselves from ceremonial defilement 'that they might eat the passover' (18²⁸). The true paschal lamb was in their midst; but they preferred the shadow to the substance, the type to the antitype. Jesus had offered his flesh and blood in the synagogue at Capernaum to be the true meat and drink of the genuine paschal meal (6^{51, 55}). This was a foretelling of his death as well as a eucharistic discourse. Yet when his words were at length fulfilled and the true passover sacrifice had been offered (19³⁰), the only concern of 'the Jews' (19³¹) was to get his body out of the way that *it* might not defile *their* passover! But their last plot for the desecration of the sacred body was defeated by the providence of God. The chosen eye-witness, too, was there to see what actually happened to the body of God's true Lamb. So he was able to make his solemn deposition:

And he that hath seen hath borne witness, and his witness is true: and he knoweth that he saith true, that ye also may believe. For these things came to pass, that the scripture might be fulfilled.
(John 19^{35, 36})

This is a challenge by the evangelist to his readers; and it is in accordance with that other challenge given at passover-time in the Galilean synagogue.

Jesus, the true Lamb of God, having died as a sacrificial victim to take away the sin of the world, gives his flesh 'for the life of the world' (1²⁹, 6⁵¹). In the Lamb of God the fragmentary truths of the Old Testament are integrated.¹ The guilt-offering of the Servant² and the passover sacrifice are one. The Lamb of God was once for all offered to take away the world's sin. His blood flowed forth for our transgressions. But the efficacy of that blood once spilt does not pass away. It is ever taking away the sin of the world. It ever avails to be sprinkled upon guilty souls.³ So cleansed from the stains of guilt by the precious blood we may dare to approach the true paschal feast without which we have no 'life' in ourselves (6⁵³). The removal of the world's sin was effected by the giving of Christ's flesh for the world's life (6⁵¹). The word 'flesh' is used by the evangelist throughout this eucharistic passage; possibly, again, he is

¹ see above, p. 387, on Heb. 13^{10, 11}

² Isa. 53¹⁰

³ 1 Pet. 1², 1 John 1⁷, Heb. 12²¹

asserting the reality of our Lord's human flesh against current heresy. But in the section of his narrative which deals with our Lord's dead body he uses the ordinary word for a body (19³¹–20¹²). It is the word used in 2²¹ for 'the temple of his body'.¹ That temple of his body was 'destroyed' by the Jews on Golgotha. Yet, secured from desecration, it was granted to Joseph by Pilate for burial (19^{38,40}). The dead body of Jesus had hung between the bodies of two criminals and had nearly shared the same fate (19³¹). Now, however, under overruling providence the dead body of the true paschal lamb was laid honourably in the tomb, its temporary resting-place, whilst the Jews kept the 'preparation' of *their* passover (19⁴²).

But in the place where the dead body was laid it could no longer be found on Easter Day (20¹²). For in 'three days' it was raised from the dead (2²¹). The flesh of Jesus had been given for the life of the world (6⁵¹). His blood had been spilt on the Cross (19³⁴). So now his flesh and blood were available to restore the world's life. Therefore 'he that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life' here and now; for he partakes of the sacrificial and glorified life of the risen Lord. There is planted in him a seed of eternal life which will bear fruit hereafter in the resurrection; and for this every Eucharist prepares (6⁵⁴). The climax of this discourse is reached in 6^{56,57}. The first of these two verses links the whole doctrine of the eucharistic food with the teaching about mutual abiding.² The Christian passover meal is no mere memorial of redemption, as the Jewish passover was. In it we partake of the living Christ, so that our life becomes organic to his; or rather that organic union which has already taken place is continuously renewed and built up. Moreover it is a mystical union of the soul with Christ such as St. Paul described in Galatians 2²⁰. The union is personal and reciprocal. It is a form of mystical identification to which there are no adequate analogies, but which supplies its own authentication.

The mutual indwelling of 6⁵⁶ and 14²⁰ has a parallel in the mutual knowledge of 10^{14,15}. In all of these passages the mutual relations of Christ and the believer are compared to the mutual relations of the Father and the Son.³ Personal knowledge based

¹ see above, pp. 317–319

² cp. 14²⁰, 15^{4–7}, 1 John 4^{13,16}

³ cp. p. 418 above, and see John 6⁵⁷

upon sympathy and community of character may reach such a unity of spirit and insight as to involve mutual interpenetration. The union of love is based upon mutual understanding. So St. Paul says that 'he that is joined unto the Lord is one spirit'. This spiritual identification of persons is the highest kind of identification. It is the essence of that Common Life with which this book is concerned; and in the life of the Godhead it is the coinherence of the Persons in the Blessed Trinity. The words 'life', 'living' and 'live' occur nine times in the eight verses of John 6⁵¹⁻⁵⁸. In contrast to the dead body of chapter 19, these verses refer to the flesh and blood of One who communicates to us his divine-human life, because he is alive for evermore. This he does in the sanctuary of his risen body (2²¹).

CHAPTER XIV

THE COMMON LIFE IN THE BODY OF CHRIST

Our Lord's communion with his Father was the basis of his whole incarnate life on earth. The life of human response to 'my God' was sustained by the Son's eternal interchanges of love with 'my Father'. The probation and the ordeal of his voluntary self-oblation were the divine answer to the sin of the world. His true human worship had to be rendered through the expiatory sacrifice of his death, that we sinners, included in the divine-human Priest-Victim, might have access to our God and communion with our Father. So the circuit of the Son's response to the Father includes us within its orbit. In this, too, redemption corresponds to creation. Our created affinity to the eternal Son means that our filial response to the heavenly Father belongs to the plan of creation. Redemption restores this plan and brings it to fulfilment through the sacrificial response of the incarnate Son. The organism of that sacrificial response is the Body of Christ. By inclusion in his Body we are included in his sacrifice, the true worship which the Father seeks in his worshippers and finds only in his Son.

The plan of St. John's Gospel shows that the eucharistic flesh and blood are given to us on the basis of our Lord's resurrection. The eucharistic body presupposes the risen body. It is the risen Lord of chapter 20 who fulfils the promises of chapter 6.¹ From this point of view we must understand, not only the direct references to our future resurrection in verses 39, 40 and 54, but also the teaching of verses 56 and 57. Here it is first stated that the eucharistic feeding issues in mutual indwelling as between Christ and the communicant believer. But this statement is then explained by reference to the analogy which it bears to the union of the Father and the Son. To this explanation we must now turn our attention. A parallel is here drawn between the dependence of the believer on Christ and the dependence of Christ on the Father. The Father is the source

¹ This is symbolically indicated in 21¹⁻¹⁴, with which compare and contrast ch. 6.

of the Son's life; and so too Christ is the source of the believer's life. There is therefore a chain of communication which has its source in the Father. The believer is the last link in the chain. For this reason the Lord is represented as emphasizing the life-giving character of the Father. Elsewhere he refers to himself as the living bread, the source of life, or simply the Life.¹ But here he uses 'a phrase unique in the N.T.'² The living God of both covenants is 'the living Father' of Jesus. He is the source of all created life as 'the living God'. Here, however, he is referred to, not as the creator, but as the Father of his Only Son. He is the eternal fount of life within the Godhead. The Son lives in dependence upon that fountain-source.

In the parallelism of John 6⁵⁷ the meaning of the second half of the verse must be determined strictly by reference to the first half. Each half of the verse, however, also contains two parts. Thus the concluding words of the whole verse correspond to the concluding words of the first part:

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| (1) As the living Father sent me, | (2) and I live because of the Father; |
| (3) So he that eateth me, | (4) he also shall live because of me. |

(4) corresponds to (2) as (3) to (1). Now the parallelism of (4) with (2) is perfectly clear. But this is not so in the case of (3) and (1). Our life depends upon Christ, as his depends upon the Father. Hence in this gospel our Lord twice calls himself 'the Life' (11²⁵, 14⁶). For he is the fountain-source of life to the redeemed in the new creation, just as his Father is the fountain-source of life to the only-begotten Son. Moreover in the prologue (1¹⁻⁴) it is also made clear that the Word is the fountain-source of life to the first creation. There is therefore no difficulty about the parallelism of (4) and (2). On the other hand (3) and (1) are statements which are quite different in form. The difference appears also to extend to their substance. Yet there is one point where an analogy lies on the surface. Both (1) and (3) state a relation of dependence. He who is sent undertakes an activity derived from him who sends. So also the eater depends for life upon that which he eats.

The disparity between clauses (1) and (3) is due to two features: namely, first the apparent irrelevance of 'eating' to

¹ 6⁵¹, 14¹⁹, 11²⁵, 14⁶

² Bernard, *ad loc.* (p. 213)

'sending', and secondly the change of order. In clauses (1) and (3) Christ is the object in both cases, whereas the second pair of clauses would suggest that Christ would be the subject in clause (3). The exact parallel which we should expect is to be found in 20²¹: 'As the Father hath sent me, even so send I you.'¹ What, then, is the parallel between the mission of the Son and the nourishment of the disciple? Before we attempt to answer that question we must notice the significance of the word 'sent'. This word tells us at once that the first part of the verse is concerned, not with the eternal relations of the 'essential' Trinity, but with the 'temporal' mission of the Son. This must apply to clause (2) as well as to clause (1). Of course, here as always, the relationship of the incarnate Son to the Father is grounded upon the eternal relationship referred to in 17⁵: 'the glory which I had with thee before the world was.' Nevertheless the words: 'I live because of the Father' must refer to the incarnate life of our Lord, which originated in the mission upon which the Father sent him. So we may conclude that the analogy of (4) to (2) is as follows: The communicant believer will live in dependence upon the incarnate Son as the source of his life, just as the incarnate Son himself lives in dependence upon the Father as the source of his life.

The change of order in the second half of the verse is not simply a matter of style. For, whereas the first half-verse throws all the emphasis upon the Father, the second half throws all the emphasis upon the believer. The whole series of statements in verses 54-58 is about the communicant believer; the phrase 'he that eateth' is used four times over to begin a sentence. In this sequence the emphasis lies upon the initiative of the disciple. The phrase corresponds to: 'he that beholdeth' and: 'he that believeth' earlier in the discourse (vv. 35, 40, 47).² The Father has taken the initiative in sending his Son into the world for our salvation. So the believer is challenged to take the step of freely accepting the great gift which has been made accessible to him through this divine action. God requires our co-operation, if his plan of salvation through the Son is to take effect in us. This applies to the sacraments as truly as to other

¹ cp. also 17¹⁸

² cp. also: 'he that cometh' (v. 38), and: 'except ye eat . . . and drink' (v. 53)

aspects of our life. Sacraments are 'moral instruments'¹ which challenge us to respond to God's love. Here we may find a point of connexion between the mission of the Son and the nourishment of the disciple. In both the Father takes the initiative; yet in both this divine action calls forth response.

The connexion between the mission of the Son and the nourishment of the disciple is to be found in that great saying in 4³⁴ which we considered in Chapter XII.² Our 'bread for the coming day' depends upon the self-oblation of the Son. We feed upon him who feeds upon the Father's will. His life is one of filial response to the Father. The incarnate life of our Lord on earth was wholly occupied with the fulfilment of his mission. He lived only with this one object, to carry out the Father's purpose. This single aim absorbed his whole being. So when he says: 'I live because of the Father', he is not simply acknowledging the Father as the source of his incarnate life; for every word in this verse is significant of the meaning of the whole. Now the human life of our Lord derived its whole character from the nature of the mission upon which he was sent.³ That mission was originated by one who is 'the living Father'. It was appropriately committed to one who eternally shares the livingness of the Father's life. Moreover, because 'that which hath been made was life in him,'⁴ it was also appropriate that the Son should restore life to his fallen creation. This was the purpose of his mission; and his incarnate life was conformed to this purpose. The Word became flesh that the Father might be glorified in and through the sacrifice of his Son. So our Lord says that the Father's will is his nourishment; and we are left in no doubt as to what that will involved for the Son (3¹⁴, 1²⁹). The Son *must* be lifted up like the serpent; from the first he is the predestined Lamb whom God provides to take away the world's sin. The incarnate Son's life is one of conformity to this sacrificial goal. His daily nourishment is the Father's will that he shall die. He is absorbed in sacrificial response to the sacri-

¹ Hooker, *The Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, Bk. V, lvii, 4

² see above, pp. 369, 370

³ cp. the sequence of thought in Heb. 2⁹⁻¹⁸, where the Incarnation involves likeness to us in suffering and probation, because of the whole divine plan lying behind it.

⁴ 1⁴ (RV margin)

ficial purpose of the Father. The words: 'I live because of the Father' take us one step further. The glory of the Son was most fully manifested in his supreme sacrifice upon the Cross. But this 'glory' is 'the glory as of the only-begotten from the Father'. The glory which is manifested in sacrifice comes from the Father to the Son, before it returns from the Son in sacrificial response to the Father. It is sacrificial glory, and as such proceeds from the heart of God.

The words: 'I live because of the Father' therefore mean that the incarnate Son lives in his earthly life such a life as proceeds from the living Father. The derived life of the Son is sacrificial self-giving to the uttermost, because it proceeds from a fount of life which has this same fundamental character. The Father sent the Son to manifest in dependence upon the Father that holy life of love which is the essential life of God. Now the manifesting of that life reached its fulfilment in our Lord's death for our sins, and its fruition in all that follows from that death. All this is expressed exactly in 1 John 4^{9,10}. The ultimate object of the mission, there as in John 6⁵⁷, is 'that we might live through him'. But its immediate end was the expiatory sacrifice of the Son 'for our sins'. All of these conceptions meet in the picture of the Lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world by his outpoured blood, that his believing disciples may feast upon his sacrifice. 'He that eateth me, he also shall live because of me.' The 'he also' is emphatic. The man who is thus privileged lives in dependence upon Christ in a manner which has real correspondence with the life of Christ as lived in dependence upon the Father.

At one end of the chain is the communicant disciple feeding upon Christ. At the other end is the Father sending the Son on his mission to Calvary.¹ To feed upon him who was sent by the Father is to partake of the mission which was fulfilled on the Cross. The stream of communicated life which flows from 'the living Father' reaches the believer through the sacrificial death in which the mission was accomplished. We do not, however, feed upon a dead victim, but upon the living Lord, who has passed triumphantly through death to the risen life. Our partaking of Christ is a partaking of the living One in whom the fruits of his sacrificial death are ever present. This is suitably

¹ For the connexion of thought see above, pp. 366-372

indicated by a change of language. 'He that eateth me' (v. 57) takes the place of: 'he that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood' (v. 56). The balance of truth is preserved in the two verses together. Verse 56 tells us that to partake of Christ's life sacrificed in death is the way to mutual abiding. The outward sacramental act of eating and drinking is the means to an interior personal communion in which there is mutual interpenetration of Christ and the believer. In verse 57 the simple phrase: 'he that eateth me' brings together these two sides, the outward and the inward, the sacramental and the mystical. The act of sacramental eating is in itself an act of mystical appropriation or assimilation by which the living Lord enters and penetrates the soul, taking up his abode therein.

This sacramental act is a free act of the believer whereby he identifies himself with the sacrificial mission of the Son. To partake of Christ is to identify ourselves with his sacrifice. It is to commit ourselves afresh to a sacrificial life, which is his life as he receives it from the Father. Thus of our free will we accept the position of the paschal victim as our own. His dedication in the body prepared by the Father¹ becomes once more our dedication in bodies prepared, with the concomitant implication of minds transformed.² The sacramental life is a life of consecration and mission dependent upon Christ's consecration and mission,³ and having the same pattern as his. The pattern is the same, because the life is the same. For our life is of one substance with his, as his is of one substance with the Father's. How and in what sense these things can be true is implied both at the beginning and at the end of the eucharistic passage (6^{51,58}) and in some further explanations given in verses 62, 63. It is significant that in this eucharistic teaching language is used which is parallel to that of the baptismal discourse (3³⁻¹⁴). 'The living bread which came down out of heaven' (6^{51,58}) answers to: 'the Son of man who came down out of heaven' (3¹³). In chapter 3 this statement is linked with an allusion to the idea of ascension;⁴ whereas in 6⁶² the difficulties found in the

¹ Heb. 10⁵⁻¹⁰² Rom. 12^{1,2}³ John 17¹⁷⁻¹⁸

⁴ ἀναβέβηκεν in 3¹³ does not contain any direct reference to our Lord's Ascension. (See the excellent note by Lagrange, *Évangile selon Saint Jean*, pp. 80, 81; cp. also Bernard, p. 111). Yet the evangelist, in recording this saying, must have had our Lord's Ascension in mind (cp. 6⁶², 20¹⁷).

eucharistic teaching are met with an explicit reference to our Lord's Ascension. Finally, in 6⁶³ the contrast between 'flesh' and 'spirit' (3⁶) is reasserted.¹

The sacraments correspond to the Son of Man. Like him they belong to two worlds, an earthly and a heavenly (3¹²). He came down from heaven in fulfilment of his mission, and ascends thither again. Throughout this double journey there is continuity of his person. He who 'came down out of heaven' is 'the Son of man' (3¹³). But he existed as the Only Son in heaven before he became Son of Man (17⁵). So also he says: 'I am the living bread which came down out of heaven'; and he whom the believer 'eats' is that bread from heaven (6^{51, 57, 58}). The idiom is the same as in 3¹³. What is asserted is not the pre-existence of our Lord's 'flesh', but of his person. Because he came down from heaven he can speak with assurance of mysteries, heavenly and earthly. For the same reason he can bestow upon us new life 'from above', and sustain it from the unfailing resources which are at his disposal. Now bread represents the resources of nature changed into a form which is adapted to sustain the human body. So the Son of Man, by coming down from heaven, put at our disposal the resources of that life which he receives from his Father. This he did in a form suited to the needs of our entire nature. Moreover, as the natural resources must lose their own life in order that they may pass into a form which can sustain our bodies, so it was too with the Son of Man. It was not sufficient for him to come down from heaven to enter our earthly life. He *must* also be lifted up on the Cross (3¹⁴). He must needs pass through death and resurrection (12²⁴), that he may ascend once more to heaven. The corn of wheat, except it die, 'abideth alone.' Its fruitfulness depends upon its change of form.

The title 'Son of man' was our Lord's own title for himself. As such it is faithfully reproduced in the fourth gospel in sayings which the evangelist attributes to the Lord (3¹³, 6⁶²). It has reference to the incarnate state. Further, 'the living bread which came down out of heaven' also implies the incarnate state. For it suggests the idea of One who, in coming down out of heaven, became accessible to us to sustain our lives through a concrete, organic form. But it suggests also the change

¹ see above, p. 218

referred to above, whereby that organic form becomes adapted to our spiritual sustenance. Now the dialogue shows that two difficulties are felt by those who hear the discourse in John 6. The first is the difficulty of supposing that a man of flesh and blood could have come down from heaven (vv. 41, 42). This difficulty is met in verse 62 with the reference to the coming Ascension. He whom some of the bystanders will or may see 'ascending where he was before' is of heavenly origin, as that event will clearly show. The other difficulty is expressed in the question: 'How can this man give us his flesh to eat?' (v. 52). This is directly answered by the saying about 'spirit' and 'flesh' in verse 63. But that saying is closely dependent upon the preceding reference to the Ascension (v. 62).

The Son of Man is the living bread from heaven. For, first, he has a heavenly origin. He was in heaven before, and will return thither after, his present earthly life. Secondly, he is 'living' bread, because he himself draws his life from 'the living Father'. But as the eucharistic teaching presupposes our Lord's death and resurrection as the basis of its fulfilment, so also it presupposes his ascension. When the Word became 'flesh', that was the first indispensable step towards the supply of living bread to meet our need. But the Incarnation *in itself* is not the completed plan of redemption. So also 'flesh' *in itself* 'is of no avail' (v. 63). It is frail and mortal. Until Jesus was 'glorified' he was circumscribed. He could not do the 'greater works' (14¹²); he could not say to the disciples many things which he had to say (16¹²). The works and the sayings would become possible after the glorification, through the gift of the Spirit (7³⁹, 16^{13*}). All this is in agreement with the doctrine of the humiliation set forth in the other gospels, in St. Paul and in the Epistle to the Hebrews. Such facts, however, do not mean that 'the flesh' of Jesus 'is of no avail'. For in that flesh he had spoken to them words which 'are spirit and life' (6⁶³). There is a close parallel to this language about 'flesh' and 'spirit' in 1 Peter 3¹⁸, where it is said that Christ was 'put to death in the flesh, but quickened in the spirit'.¹ When the Son of Man came down to earth he lived the mortal life of 'flesh' proper to this earthly scene. Finally he submitted himself to death, which is the common lot of the flesh. For 'flesh' is heir to the mortality

¹ cp. also 4⁶

of earth, whereas 'spirit' has its true home in the heavenly life. To this heavenly life our Lord returned through his quickening in the spirit at the Resurrection, and through 'ascending where he was before' at the Ascension.

The limitations of 'flesh' were ended in him when the mortal body was transformed into the risen body. Then he who had already spoken words of spirit and of life assumed in their fulness the functions of 'life-giving spirit' which from the first were his prerogative because he is 'the second man, from heaven'.¹ In 1 Corinthians 15 'life-giving spirit' is connected with a heavenly origin. This agrees with the teaching of John 3^{6,7} where the birth 'from above' (v. 3) is declared to be necessarily a birth 'from the spirit' in contrast to birth 'from the flesh' (vv. 5-7). God is Spirit (4²⁴); and heavenly life is the life of 'spirit'. Now the Son of Man came down from heaven (3¹³), and therefore fulfils the condition that 'he that cometh from above is above all' (3³¹). This truth was not nullified when the Word became 'flesh'. But its full implications were manifested only after he was 'glorified', and especially after the Ascension, when the Son of Man returned 'where he was before'. In the ascended life he receives the fulness of his sovereignty as the Son of Man. In his heavenly life he is able, not only to bestow life 'from above', but also to exercise the functions of his glorified human nature under conditions of spirit. Jesus glorified bestows the Spirit from that heavenly home where spirit is supreme because God is Spirit. So the eucharistic teaching is to be understood by reference to the truth that 'it is the Spirit that quickeneth'.

In 3⁵⁻⁷ the contrast between 'flesh' and 'spirit' is a contrast between human nature in itself and the Holy Spirit of God. The same contrast appears in 6⁶³. In both passages the objections raised are due to the fact that the objectors are looking only at the resources of human nature without taking into account the possibilities of divine power. In both instances the contrast is not between the material and the spiritual, but between the limitations of mortal man and the creative power

¹ 1 Cor. 15^{45,47}. The implication of v. 45 is that, as the first Adam became a living soul at his creation, so the last Adam became 'a life-giving spirit' at the beginning of his earthly existence. But he began to exercise the functions of life-giving spirit *in their fulness* only after the resurrection.

of God.¹ But further, the distinction made in 6⁶³ between the creative power of the divine Spirit and the weakness of mortal flesh cannot be understood to imply merely a contrast between the divine prerogatives of the Holy Spirit and the human limitations of Jesus. There are three reasons why this interpretation is impossible: (i) In the first place Jesus has described his heavenly origin and life-giving powers in referring to himself as the bread from heaven. (ii) Secondly, he has supported these claims by a reference to his own future Ascension to the heaven where he was before his earthly life, whence also the new birth from the Spirit comes (cp. 3⁸⁻¹³). (iii) Finally the saying that 'it is the Spirit that quickeneth' in contrast to the weakness of the flesh is illustrated immediately afterwards from our Lord's own words which are declared to be both 'spirit' and 'life'. In fact, the words of Jesus during his sojourn in mortal 'flesh' partake of 'the Spirit', and of 'the life' which the Spirit bestows. Moreover the appeal which our Lord here makes, by reference to the life-giving character of his own words, bears fruit immediately afterwards. While others are offended, the Twelve come through the test. The reasons for their fidelity are given by Peter: 'Thou hast words of eternal life,' and: 'Thou art the Holy One of God' (vv. 68, 69).

The implications of these two statements, when taken together, are unmistakable. The Holy One of God is he who was anointed with the Spirit in consecration for his mission as Messiah and Servant. The disciples have come to believe and know that Jesus is the Holy One because they have received his words. They have interior certainty of the fact that those words are life-giving, as he said (vv. 63, 68). They have found in them the quality of eternal life. For this reason they have recognized in him the fulfilment of prophecy:

The spirit of the Lord God is upon me; because the LORD hath anointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek. (Isa. 61¹)

They had pierced behind the outward veil of mortal flesh to the glory of the Only Son, the Lamb of God, on whom the Spirit descended. 'For it is the Spirit that quickeneth.' Such words could only come from One who, notwithstanding his mortal manhood, was anointed with the quickening Spirit of God. Until

¹ see above, pp. 215-219

Jesus was glorified his glory was not made public. The Light of the world was accessible only to the eye of faith. But the eye-witnesses who received his life-giving, spirit-quickenened words believed, and actually saw the glory of the Word made flesh; although of course they did not understand as yet more than a fragment of what they saw. Yet what they did understand was enough. Jesus was the Holy One of God. His words therefore came from God (17⁸). The good tidings were preached to the poor from the time of that first sermon at Nazareth (Luke 4¹⁶⁻²¹). For some at least the words of Jeremiah received a fresh fulfilment:

Thy words were found, and I did eat them; and thy words were unto me a joy and the rejoicing of mine heart. (Jer. 15¹⁶)

But the words of God are sometimes difficult, and so bring bitterness to the eater. This was our Lord's own experience,¹ and was inevitably shared by his disciples, as they were initiated.² Yet they remained loyal, because the seeds of eternal life had already been sown in their hearts. They were learning to have faith as a grain of mustard-seed; so for them the claims of Jesus must be true, though they passed human understanding. The eucharistic teaching was inevitably beyond their understanding until after Jesus had been glorified. Yet when the words of Jesus appeared to raise an insurmountable barrier they fell back upon the truth incarnate in the speaker himself. For, as he told them on another occasion, 'with men this is impossible; but with God all things are possible' (Matt. 19²⁶).

There are thus two aspects of our Lord's teaching as represented in St. John's Gospel, and as illustrated by the saying in 6⁶³. Christ spoke to men in human terms about subjects which he called 'the earthly things' (3¹²). He appealed to the knowledge which was already in them about the things of God and of man, and to the testimony of the Scriptures which they knew. His words were challenging and testing words; and inevitably they carried his hearers out of their depth. That was part of the mystery of his person. To that mystery the words were intended to lead them. His attitude to his hearers is summed up in three phrases: 'What seek ye? . . . Come and ye shall see. . . Thou shalt see greater things than these' (1^{38, 39, 50}).

¹ in a sense peculiar to him as the incarnate Word; see above, pp. 369-372

² see above, pp. 244, 245 and 281, 282

Through the mysterious words he is ever inviting them into fellowship with himself, the mysterious person, and so leading them to the greater things which are prepared for those who follow that path. The words are inevitably mysterious; but so are all great treasures of truth. Moreover the words cannot be separated from the person who speaks them. They come from him with quickening power, even when they are found difficult and strange. They have a challenging force, because they are the words of this speaker and of no one else.

For the man who 'hateth the light and cometh not to the light' (3²⁰) there remains only the evidence of 'flesh' which 'avails nothing' (6⁶³). When the Word became 'flesh' the possibility of his rejection was rendered inevitable by that very fact. The works which he wrought were signs which could not compel faith. On the other hand to 'as many as received him' his words brought eternal life, because he himself is the incarnate Word. From him life flowed to 'them that believe on his name'. Their new birth was after the pattern of his human birth, who was 'begotten, not of bloods, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God'.¹ He was not only anointed with the Spirit (1³²), but also 'conceived of the Holy Ghost'.² In his words and works there was present the life of the new creation, because they proceeded from the Word through whom all things were made (1³), and that too by the quickening power of the creative Spirit (6⁶³). 'The living Father' (6⁵⁷) has 'life in himself'; and the Son who lives 'because of the Father' shares the same prerogative (5²⁶). To each of the divine Persons the creative function of 'quickening' is ascribed in this gospel.³ Now this creative power is also in some sense a communication of divine life. This is consistently implied in all the Johannine language about the new birth.⁴ The living God, then, mysteriously imparted to man in

¹ 1^{12, 13} (RV margin). Whichever reading be adopted in 1¹³ the language employed contains an unmistakable reference to the Virgin Birth. But also (reading *οἱ*) this seems to be another instance of Johannine ambiguity; see above, pp. 316, 319. The plural form (*ἐξ αἱμάτων*) can be taken to deny (a) physical birth, or (b) the union of two human parents. Thus positively the verse affirms (a) the New Birth and (b) the Virgin Birth, *defining the former in terms of the latter*. The re-birth of every believer was implicitly contained in the Virgin Birth of Jesus.

² Matt. 1²⁰, Luke 1³⁵

³ 5²¹, 6⁶³; see also above, p. 267, n. 5

⁴ 1^{12, 13}, 3⁵⁻⁷, 1 John 3⁹, 5¹⁸ *et al.*

the order of creation that life which is ever communicated by the Father to the Son.¹ When the Word became flesh there was already in man something which could recognize and respond to 'words of eternal life'. This explains the statement of 6⁴⁴ that 'no man can come to me, except the Father which sent me draw him'. The 'drawing' of the Father is the counterpart of the biblical truths that man is made in God's image and that Christ is the image of God.²

The life which is eternally common to the divine Persons was imparted through the words and works of the Son, the quickening power of the Spirit being present in them. But neither words nor works are the whole of life. Moreover the witness of both was given in the order of 'flesh'. Not until this mortal flesh had been transformed through death could the fulness of life be communicated in the order of 'spirit'. For this reason many of our Lord's most pregnant words in the fourth gospel refer to mysteries whose truth could be fully illuminated only in the future. This fact has special relevance to the great discourse in the upper room. For there our Lord set himself to explain this very point, that only through his death and journey to the Father could the meaning of his words become clear. There the most profound revelations were given. But not even the words of Christ could impart what cannot be imparted through words. Not even words which are 'spirit' and 'life' can impart the fulness of life. In the upper room that fulness is still in the future: 'because I live, ye also shall live.' The going of Christ will lead to the coming of the Paraclete and the mystical glorification. This concentration upon what is yet to come is, however, crossed continually by language which seems to emphasize present realities. The disciples are already branches of the Vine. Moreover, 'already ye are clean because of the word which I have spoken unto you' (15³; cp. 13¹⁰). They already know the Spirit; for he abides with them and is in them.³ This language

¹ cp. Gen. 2⁷, 1 Cor. 15⁴⁵, Acts 17²⁵⁻²⁸. The communication of the divine life in the new creation clearly presupposes its communication *in some sense* in the first creation. But this truth was not reached simply by deduction from the Old Testament. It was a corollary of the Christian revelation.

² Gen. 1^{26,27}, 1 Cor. 11⁷, 2 Cor. 4⁴, Col. 1¹⁵

³ 14¹⁷; 'shall be' is an obvious correction of language which seemed too paradoxical.

of present realities is parallel to the eucharistic institution in the other accounts of the last night in the upper room. The disciples partake of Christ's Body and Blood, although the Lord is present with them in his mortal body. They are initiated into the coming messianic events before those events take place. The disciples are already one with Christ in his life, words and works through the quickening power of the Spirit. By the power of the Lord's consecrating words and acts they are even made one with him in the mystery of his coming sacrificial death and in its predestined consequences. The grace which they received in all this corresponded to the grace which he was able to bestow at each stage of their initiation (1¹⁶).¹

Already they had received more than they knew or could know. But 'in that day ye shall know' the truth of a reality which was already in existence. 'In that day ye shall know that I am in my Father and ye in me and I in you' (14²⁰). The Common Life in its human aspect was already present in the upper room. Indeed this mutual abiding of Christ and his disciples had begun to be as soon as they responded to his call.² But its present reality was from the first taken up into the greater and eternally present reality of the divine *koinonia*, the mutual abiding of the Father and the Son. We here touch the most mysterious aspect of St. John's Gospel. The glory of the only-begotten Son irradiates the whole story; it therefore enters into the disciples before the glorification on the Cross has taken place. This fact is definitely stated in the high-priestly prayer in a context which is deeply significant:

And the glory which thou hast given me I have given unto them; that they may be one, even as we are one; I in them, and thou in me, that they may be perfected into one; that the world may know that thou didst send me, and lovedst them, even as thou lovedst me. (John 17^{22, 23})

Already the disciples are partakers in the whole treasure of the divine-human life as it exists in the incarnate Son. They possess 'the glory'; but their possession of it is as a seed of eternal life whose fulness is yet to be attained. That life is in them in a form

¹ see above, pp. 387, 388, 394

² John 1^{38, 39}. There is a subtle use of μένειν and μονή in this gospel; cp. 6⁵⁶, 14^{2, 10, 17, 23}, and 21²⁰⁻²³ (on which see Hoskyns, *The Fourth Gospel*, ad loc.). 21²⁰ in turn refers back to 13²⁵ and so to 1¹⁸.

which is to be 'perfected' in the future. As branches of the Vine they already share the unity of the divine-human life. Their unity with one another in Christ already has that absolute quality. It is a unity created by participation in the glory. Yet the glory was given to them that the unity, thus already present, might be perfected.

The contrast here corresponds to that in the later Pauline epistles,—the contrast between present fulness and final fulness.¹ The glory has been given; and so the Church is already the fulness of Christ. But the Church must grow into a 'perfect man', if the fulness of Christ is to be manifested.² In both passages³ the final fulness is thought of in terms of a perfected unity. Moreover in Ephesians and in the Pauline epistles generally there is the same further implication which is explicit in John 17²³. The glory has been given for the perfect endowment and fulfilment of the Church; but the Church is not an end in herself. Her life is to reach its fulfilment in order that 'the world may know that thou didst send me, and lovedst them, even as thou lovedst me'. In other words the glory has been given to the disciples that the world may come to recognize the mission of the Son and to believe in it (cp. v. 21). This conversion of the world to faith in the Son will carry with it a recognition of the identity existing between Christ and his disciples, because the disciples are objects of that love wherewith the Father loves the Son. The conversion of the world to Christ will mean that the world also acknowledges the significance of the life lived in Christ, the true Vine, the New Israel. This is the complement of the truth that the conversion of the world depends upon the perfected unity of the Church (vv. 21, 23).⁴

The gift of the glory (v. 22) refers primarily to the Eleven, as the faithful eye-witnesses of that glory (1¹⁴). But, as there so here, they are the representatives of all believers, who have been expressly included in this part of the prayer (vv. 20, 21).

¹ cp. especially Eph. 4¹³⁻¹⁶; and see above, pp. 307ff, 310ff, 312

² cp. the two stages of grafting in Chapter II; see above, pp. 63-65

³ Eph. 4¹³, John 17^{22, 23}

⁴ There is in St. John's Gospel a sustained emphasis upon unity, and a hunger for its final manifestation; cp. the singular (*πᾶν ὅ*) in 6^{37, 38}, the 'one flock, one shepherd' in 10¹⁶ answering to 10³⁰ (*εἷς ἐσμεν*), and the 'prophecy' of Caiaphas about the 'one man', whose death is to issue in his gathering into one (*εἰς ἓν*) the scattered children of God (11⁴⁰⁻⁵²).

There is therefore a descending scale of participation in the glory of the divine life, a *scala communicationis*. 'Before the world was' the Son shared, as he ever shares, the eternal glory of the Father (17⁵). This is the divine *koinonia*¹ from which proceeds forth the Paraclete, 'the Spirit of the truth' (15²⁶).² When the Word became flesh, human nature as such was taken into the divine *koinonia*; and the divine-human life of the Son became the *locus* of the human *koinonia*. 'The glory of the only-begotten from the Father' became accessible to human eye-witnesses; and these in turn became, through their participation in the divine *koinonia*, the nucleus of that human fellowship which is one aspect of the divine-human life (1 John 1). For the mystical body is one aspect of the divine-human life of the Christ. The divine-human organism has a double polarity;³ for it is the sphere of that life which is common to Christ and the Church, the Bridegroom and the Bride, the Head and the Body. This twofold language in which the Church is called both bride and body has a significance of its own to which we must now pay attention.

The highest kind of identity is that personal identity which is realized in personal relationships. This exists in its complete form only in the life of the Blessed Trinity. Human speech cannot express the truth of this perfect identity of love except in words drawn from human relationships. This human language is profoundly inadequate to the truth of the divine life. But it is the only language available; and, as set forth in Scripture and safeguarded in the tradition of the Church, it is sufficient for our guidance. Moreover the knowledge which we have concerning the divine life comes to us through the incarnate Son and through his bestowal of the Spirit. We know the divine *koinonia* only in and through the divine-human life of the Christ. The sphere of this knowledge is the common life which we possess in him. We know the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit through the participation of the Son in our nature. But since the perfection of human nature cannot exist apart from the divine Spirit, the incarnate Son possesses the fulness

¹ 1 John 1³

² cp. Rev. 22¹, where the waters of the Spirit proceed from the throne of God and the Lamb.

³ see above, pp. 57, 64 (n. 1), 345

of his own Spirit through the anointing of his humanity with the Spirit. It is, therefore, in the Spirit-endowed, Spirit-quickenened flesh of the incarnate Word that we know God and participate in the divine life.

It follows that two types of language are appropriate to the divine-human life of Christ in the Church. In the life common to him and to us there is a mystical identity, which corresponds to the life common to the Persons of the Blessed Trinity. That highest kind of identification which exists as between the Persons of the Godhead is reproduced in the mystical union of Christ and the Church. The language about the Bridegroom and the Bride, being the language of personal relationships, corresponds to this analogy between the human *koinonia* and the divine *koinonia*. On the other hand no analogy drawn from human relationships can express adequately the union between God and Man in Christ, seeing that this union is a partaking in the unity of the divine life. For human social relations, even the most intimate, bear marks of finitude which set their unity in contrast to the unity of the Godhead.¹ Consequently another type of language is needed to express that unity. That language is provided in the doctrine of the Body of Christ. There is 'one body and one Spirit'. The source of unity in the Body is the Holy Spirit, as the Spirit of Christ. The Body lives one life in virtue of 'the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace'. So through the indwelling of the Spirit in Christ's Body the unity of the Godhead is represented, and in a profoundly mysterious sense reproduced, in the divine-human organism. For the Spirit is the bond of union between the Father and the Son.² Moreover the unity of the Body of Christ, thus sustained by the Spirit, has two aspects. It is a unity of the parts in the whole, as the branches in the Vine; for Christ is the Whole. It is also a unity of members with the Head; because Christ is the fountain-source from whom the one life is derived in the mystical body. Now this conception of the one organism (the human body or the vine) does not of itself include the idea of personal relationships. Its significance lies in its emphasis upon the complete oneness of the life which results from the mystical identification. For that oneness of life can never be adequately suggested by

¹ For details see *The Incarnate Lord*, chs. 13 and 14

² cp. Eph. 4¹⁻⁶

the social analogy of personal relationships. On the other hand the personal self-giving of one to another, which is the essence of love, can never be adequately represented by the language of impersonal organic unity.

This dilemma is solved in the New Testament by a free combination of both types of language. For example throughout the allegory of the Vine and its application there is a continual intermingling of both forms of speech. The language about the mutual abiding of Christ and the disciples is interwoven with the picture of the branches bearing fruit. The combination of metaphors is sometimes even more complicated, as in Ephesians 4¹²⁻¹⁶ where the organism of the body is also a temple, whose parts or members are living men growing in faith, knowledge and love. Again in Ephesians 3¹⁹ 'to know the love of Christ which passeth knowledge' is to issue in being 'filled unto all the fulness of God'. The image of mystical union through knowledge of personal love passes into a picture of fulfilment which is taken from the material world. The personal language breaks down and is replaced by the notion of pouring liquid from one vessel to another. The truth of spiritual realities has to be represented in terms drawn from the world of our sense-experience. Now it was this world of material objects and sensible images which our Lord entered when he became 'flesh'. The sphere of the Incarnation is the meeting-place of the inward and the outward, of spiritual realities and organic life, of mystical union with God and physical relationships, in short of quickening Spirit and mortal flesh which in and by itself avails nothing.

Now it is significant that the two types of language which we have been considering, as employed in the New Testament to express the idea of the Church, are linked together in the Pauline epistles by the two words 'spirit' and 'flesh' (cp. John 6⁶³). The phrase 'one spirit' expresses the union of the soul with Christ through membership in the one Body; whereas 'one flesh' expresses the union of Christ and the Church as Bridegroom and Bride.¹ The union of the Christian with Christ in 'one spirit' is the means whereby the whole *koinonia* of the Blessed Trinity becomes present in the regenerate life of man.²

¹ 1 Cor. 6¹⁵⁻¹⁷, Eph. 5²⁸⁻²⁹; see above, pp. 221-226, 253-255

² see Part I, especially Chapters IV-VI

On the other hand the intimate union of Christ and the Church in 'one flesh' reminds us of the limitations of mortal flesh as such (John 3⁶, 6⁶³). Our Lord's saying that 'the flesh is of no avail' expresses a truth of universal import with regard to this earthly life. It is further illustrated by that other saying in the garden of Gethsemane: 'the spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak' (Mark 14³⁸). It is a great mistake to suppose that this saying had no application to our Lord himself. He became 'flesh' that he might be made like to us in all things apart from sin. 'Flesh', in its normal biblical sense, means the life of man, or of creatures, in its frailty and limitations as lived on earth in the mortal body. The whole picture of our Lord's agony in the Garden, as well as the story of his temptations in the wilderness, shows that the mortal body in its weakness was the channel through which temptation came to him. This is also clearly the teaching of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

In the earthly life of the incarnate Lord the perfect humanity anointed with the Spirit was the sphere in which both the statements of John 6⁶³ held good. In the mortal life of the Only Son 'the flesh' in itself availed nothing. His life in 'the flesh', however, was lived in unceasing dependence upon the Spirit that quickeneth. He shared the weakness of 'flesh' with us, that we, united to him in the 'one flesh' of his Body, might partake of the quickening Spirit with which he was anointed. The days of his mortal weakness are now passed; but ours are not. The Common Life as lived in the Body of Christ on this earthly scene has therefore two aspects, according as we emphasize the weakness of 'the flesh' or the quickening power of the Holy Spirit. But before we consider this contrast further we must complete the picture of 'the descending scale of participation'.¹ In the high-priestly prayer of John 17 it descends from the incarnate Son to the eye-witnesses of his glory. From them in turn it passes on to all believers in Christ; and finally through the Church as a whole it passes to those who are as yet outside the Common Life. For the ultimate goal of this communication of divine life to man is nothing less than God's embrace of that world which he created and which he loves (17²⁰⁻²⁶; cp. 3¹⁶). In this graded scheme the apostles, as the initiated eye-witnesses, have an indispensable place. For they are the connecting

¹ see above, p. 440

link between the messianic history on the one hand and 'the mystical union of all believers with Christ on the other. It is, therefore, a permanent mark of the Christian life to 'adhere steadfastly to the apostles' teaching'. This condition is indispensable, because the Incarnation took a historical form whose details were determined by the nature of our Lord's mission.

We cannot rightly understand that mission apart from the events of the gospel history in which it was manifested and embodied. 'The teaching of the apostles' about the meaning of *his* mission is indispensable to the understanding of *their* mission which is the continuation of his (17¹⁸, 20²¹). The life common to Christ and his Church does not exist for its own sake. It has a mediatorial character. The Messiah and his people are sent from God to the world. The nature of the mission and the burden of its message are for ever embodied in the life of the divine-human organism.¹ This embodied revelation is the sole ultimate channel of God's appeal to the world which he loves. For the Scriptures themselves would be a sealed book apart from the embodied life of the New Creation to which they belong and to which they bear witness. On the other hand the life of the Church is secured to its moorings in history, and thereby safeguarded in its mission, through the witness of the apostles to the messianic events. For in those events the significance of the life and the nature of the mission were once for all revealed and defined. Accordingly 'the handing over' or 'delivery'² of the messianic events, the gospel history, from the original eye-witnesses, through an unending succession of persons who are authorized to represent the testimony of those original eye-witnesses, appears to belong to the very essence of the Common Life in its human form. For by this means that common life is maintained through history as the life which the first disciples shared with Jesus.

Thus the Church lives one life with the incarnate Son; and in that life, so shared, his mission to the world is fulfilled. The life and the mission which we share with him are perfectly fused into one whole in the teaching of the fourth gospel. Moreover there the twofold character of both life and mission are

¹ which is 'the One Man Jesus Christ', 'the True Vine,' 'the New Israel'

² *παράδοσις*, *traditio*; for some implications of this phraseology see above, pp. 257-259, 339-342

seen from first to last. The Word became flesh, that is mortal man: Yet in the tabernacle of his flesh, notwithstanding its mortal frailty and weakness, the eye-witnesses beheld the glory. These two contrasted conceptions of 'flesh' and 'glory' provide the foundation of those other two great pictures to which reference has frequently been made in these pages. On the Johannine Mount of Transfiguration the glory of the Only Son is flanked on either side by Moses and the new Elijah.¹ The one points to the brazen serpent on the standard; the other to the Lamb of God taking away the sin of the world. Moses points to the veiling of the divine glory under the flesh which in itself avails nothing. The new Elijah points to the glory revealed in the predestined victim, who evermore triumphantly takes away the world's sin. The Church has part in both the veiling and the manifestation. For she has died with Christ and is also risen with him. Moreover the Church sees the Cross in the light of the Resurrection and Pentecost, just as the new Elijah saw the divine victim anointed with the Spirit that quickeneth.

The Church is risen with Christ, and follows the victorious Lamb to the fountains of living waters, the waters of the Spirit who quickens. From the point of view which we are now considering the Apocalypse of St. John the Divine is an interpretation of the theme which fills the Gospel of St. John. In both it may be said that the Lamb of God conquers the serpent, although in the two books this idea has two different applications. In the gospel it is Moses' function to hold up the serpent. For in the brazen serpent God made a symbol of salvation out of a symbol of destruction. St. Paul helps us here: 'Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law, having become a curse for us: for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree' (Gal. 3¹³). This curse was pronounced by 'Moses' in Deuteronomy. Our Lord took the place of sinners when God made him to be sin on our behalf (2 Cor. 5²¹). Whatever these mysterious phrases may mean, they certainly put our Lord in the place of sinners. Mortal man, in whom the flesh avails nothing, cannot keep the Law; and so the curse of Moses is upon him. But Moses points to one who became mortal flesh to

¹ For what follows see above, pp. 246-252 with n. 7 on p. 247, and pp. 412-416

redeem us from the serpent's bite. The paschal lamb is a Mosaic symbol of the predestined victim who died in mortal weakness. But his own people Israel did not see in him the Lamb of God. For in Jesus at Golgotha¹ the glory of the Only Son was veiled under the scandal and folly of the Cross. He was cursed by 'his own', as he bore their sins and ours on the Tree. They saw only the figure of one dying the death of a criminal. They saw him under the symbolism of destruction, not of salvation.

So when he offered them his flesh and blood at Capernaum, they said: 'How can this man give us his flesh to eat?' For to those 'who are after the flesh' 'flesh avails nothing'. Now we who are risen with Christ are still in this mortal body as he once was. For us it is still true that 'the body is dead because of sin' (Rom. 8¹⁰). We are still pilgrims in the wilderness who have not yet reached the promised land. Christ has redeemed us from the curse of the law; but we are still under the discipline appropriate for sons who are also sinners (Heb. 12¹⁻¹³). We, along with the eye-witnesses, have access to the glory of the Only Son. But that glory is still veiled from the eyes of the world; and we have in us something of the world, something of the old Adam. In the Church redeemed men and women, saved from the curse of sin, must still bear their own burdens and also one another's (Gal. 6¹⁻⁵). We must still work out our salvation with fear and trembling. Moreover there is a sense in which, in every age, the veiling of the divine victim under the weakness of mortal flesh continues not only in the world, but also in the Church. Though 'we all received of his fulness' (John 1¹⁶), yet the glory is not fully manifested. The sins of Christians are part of that sin of the world which the Lamb of God is taking away. Thus, while there is sin in the members of Christ's Body the world cannot see the glory of the Only Son. Moreover, the Cross continues to be a symbol of folly and destruction, of death rather than life. The world is still the victim of 'the old serpent, he that is called the Devil and Satan'. 'The deceiver of the whole world . . . was cast down to the earth,' where he still has power (Rev. 12^{9a}). His final extermination by the Lamb lies in the future (20¹⁰). As long as the serpent, although conquered, still exercises power his dupes

¹ 'the place of the skull,' another emblem of destruction (John 19¹⁷)

will be repelled by the figure of death upon the Cross. They will see a serpent instead of the Lamb.¹

So we, who are risen with 'Christ the firstfruits', still 'groan within ourselves waiting for our adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body'.² All these things are true; and much more could be said in a similar strain. But this is not the final word, nor even the characteristic note of the Church militant here on earth. The witness of the new Elijah outshines the witness of Moses. For 'the law was given through Moses'; but 'grace and truth came through Jesus Christ'.³ John the Forerunner points to the source of grace, as his name implies.⁴ The Lamb whom God provides is that source of grace, because he was anointed with the Spirit who quickens. He is therefore also the truth, because in him all the prophetic promises came true and in him all the glory of God was revealed. Although the glory was veiled from the world it was unveiled to the believing eye-witnesses from first to last. The Servant who was led as a lamb to the slaughter, and who was despised and rejected of men, was none the less glorified on the Cross upon which he was lifted up. The 'gospel of rejection' is also a 'gospel of life'. So for Christians the serpent is a symbol of that power of evil which Christ has for ever conquered; whereas 'the Lamb of God' is the title which sums up for us the good news of the Gospel and the glory of God made known to us in his Son. Moses speaks to us in negative terms of sin, its guilt and power, and the expiatory sacrifice which is the price of our redemption.⁵ The new Elijah, on the other hand, bears witness to the flame of the Spirit descending upon the whole-burnt-offering of God's appointed victim.⁶ The dead figure of our paschal Lamb hanging upon the Cross is regarded by the chosen eye-witness in the light of the Resurrection. For the death is the foundation of the true pass-over feast.⁷ The Church can contemplate the veiled glory of the crucified with grateful exultation, because as 'sons of the

¹ just as the false prophet of 'the old serpent' combines the appearance of a lamb with the voice of his evil lord (Rev. 13¹¹)

² Rom. 8²³; cp. 1 Cor. 15²³

³ John 1¹⁷ (RV margin)

⁴ 'John' means 'the Lord is gracious'; cp. Luke 1^{13, 14}, 59-64

⁵ cp. Rom. 3²⁵ and see above, p. 251, n. 4

⁶ 1 Kings 18³⁸ and John 1³²; cp. Heb. 10¹⁻¹⁰ and Acts 2³

⁷ see above, pp. 420-424

resurrection¹ we are partakers in the manifested glory of the risen Lord. When the evangelist insists that Jesus was glorified on the Cross, he is looking back to Golgotha from that risen life upon which the ascended Lord poured out the quickening Spirit. The true glory of the Cross can be seen only in that light of the Resurrection which is ours. The full comfort of the Messiah's sufferings belongs only to those who have died and risen with him:

Yea, we ourselves have had the sentence² of death within ourselves, that we should not trust in ourselves, but in God which raiseth the dead. (2 Cor. 1⁹)³

St. John's Gospel, like the Apocalypse, symbolizes the risen life of the Church. The Lamb, slain, yet risen and triumphant, is the sanctuary to which we belong. Our life is one of joyful adoration directed towards the ever-present Lord, who, from the fulness of his God-manhood, breathes upon us the Spirit of holiness out of the risen life manifested in his sacrificial body.⁴ The rising of our Lord from the Easter sepulchre was an act of God which anticipated the end of this world. Out of the closed tomb of the old order there has broken forth a new world, —the world of the Last Day which is the eternal day of the Shekinah's Glory. In the dawn of that eternal day the Church abides, waiting in anticipation, as once in the Upper Room before Pentecost. This attitude is one, not of inactivity, but of joyful co-operation with him in whose mission to the world we are allowed to share. But only he himself can bring that mission to its predestined goal. So, having received the first-fruits of the Spirit, we await his manifestation in glory. 'And the Spirit and the bride say, Come.' 'Amen, come, Lord Jesus.'

¹ Luke 20³⁶

² RV margin

³ cp. vv. 3-7, and see also 2 Cor. 4⁷⁻¹⁸, Rom. 8¹⁸, Acts 5⁴¹, 1 Pet. 4¹⁴

⁴ John 20¹⁹⁻²⁸, Rom. 1⁴

Additional Note G.

Κοινωνία and μετοχή with their cognates in the New Testament

For the meaning of these groups of words the most recent authorities are Moulton and Milligan's *Vocabulary of the Greek Testament* (MM) and Kittel's *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament* (KTW). The former was published in one volume in 1930; vol. iii of the latter in 1938. The relevant articles in MM are on pp. 350, 351, 405, 406, and in KTW, vol. iii, on pp. 789-810; the contributor in KTW is D. F. Hauck.

(1) For these authorities the two groups of words (κοινωνεῖν and μετέχειν) 'must be regarded as synonymous' (MM, p. 405¹). So also Hauck in KTW (iii, p. 804) writes in reference to Heb. 2¹⁴: 'hier μετέσχευ, synonym zu κοινωνεώ.' Similarly on the same text Moffatt (ICC, *ad loc.*) writes of μετέχειν: 'The verb is simply a synonym for κοινωνεῖν; in the papyri and the inscriptions μετέχειν is rather more common, but there is no distinction of meaning between the two.' On the other hand, on 1 Cor. 10²⁶ RP (ICC) wrote:

'Partake' is μετέχειν: κοινωνεῖν is 'to have a share in'; therefore κοινωνία is 'fellowship' rather than 'participation'. . . . As κοινωνεῖν is 'to give a share to' as well as 'to have a share in', *communicatio* [*sanguinis*. (Vulgate)] is a possible rendering of κοινωνία. The difference between 'participation' and 'fellowship' or 'communion' is the difference between having a share and having the whole. In Holy Communion each recipient has a share of the bread and of the wine, but he has the whole of Christ: οὐ γὰρ τῷ μετέχειν μόνον καὶ μεταλαμβάνειν ἀλλὰ τῷ ἐνοῦσθαι κοινοῦμεν (Chrys.).

On this question MM observe (p. 350²) that 'Ellicott's contention (*ad* 1 Cor. 10¹⁷) that the difference sometimes drawn between κοινωνεώ (partake with others in one undivided thing) and μετέχω (share with those who also have their shares) in 1 Cor. 10^{18ff} "cannot be substantiated" is borne out by the evidence of the inscriptions¹ where the words are practically synonymous'. But MM go on to support 'Ellicott's further remark that of the two verbs κοινωνεώ "implies more distinctly the idea of a community with others"'. They proceed to quote from Brooke (ICC) on 1 John 1³: 'κοινωνεῖν is always used of active participation, where the result depends on the co-operation of the receiver as well as on the action of the giver.' Thus the weight of recent opinion does not support the sharp distinctions drawn by RP in the passage quoted above. The degree of distinction drawn by Ellicott and Brooke and accepted by MM does not carry with it the contrast made by RP between 'having a share and having the whole'. Consequently the sentence about Holy Communion with which the passage from RP concludes introduces a distinction which does not correspond

¹ MM abbreviate this word.

to St. Paul's thought in 1 Cor. 10^{16a}. On the other hand the view that *κοινωνεῖν* 'implies more distinctly the idea of a community with others' appears to have some support in N.T. usage; cp. the use of *κοινωνία* in 1 John and Brooke's remark quoted above. The quotation from St. Chrysostom, with which RP round off the passage cited, points in the same direction, although of course for a later period. For *κοινοῦμεν* is there represented both by *μετέχειν* (the sacramental act) and by *ἐνοῦσθαι* (the interior consequence).

It is clear, however, that in the New Testament the two groups of words are sometimes used *together*, as synonyms, without distinction. This occurs in Luke 5^{7,10}, 2 Cor. 6¹⁴ and Heb. 2¹⁴. It is also to be noticed that the dictionary does not support such distinctions between the corresponding English synonyms as are indicated in RP's renderings of the Greek words. The precise meaning of such words as 'partake' and 'share', as well as 'fellowship' and 'communion', depends upon the context. In particular it depends upon the nature of the objects partaken or shared, e.g. sensible or spiritual; or again it may depend upon the nature and character of the persons with whom we have fellowship or communion. Something similar must also be true of the Greek words. It was noticed in the text (p. 322) that St. Paul shows a preference for *μετέχειν* to express the notions of eating and drinking. Thus in 1 Cor. 10¹⁷ *μετέχομεν* represents the outward sacramental act. On the other hand, when the apostle wished to indicate the mysterious implications of this outward act in 10¹⁶ he used the word *κοινωνία*. The two groups of words can and do have the same meanings. Yet in certain contexts in the N.T. the *κοινωνία* group is preferred. Moreover, whereas 'in the papyri and the inscriptions *μετέχειν* is rather more common', in the N.T. the *κοινωνία* group is used much more frequently and more prominently.

(2) In his article in KTW Hauck remarks on 1 Cor. 10^{16a} that 'bread and wine are for Paul bearers of the presence of Christ' (p. 806). In a note he says that the question whether the apostle's remarks refer to 'the body of the earthly or of the exalted Lord' is not relevant (*löst sich*) for St. Paul since for him the two are identical (*er beide identisch denkt*). The whole note (58) is important. As regards the last verse of 2 Corinthians Hauck agrees with the view expressed in the present work. *Κοινωνία* there governs an objective genitive (p. 807). But Hauck seems to be over-confident in assuming that the third member of this trinitarian formula is 'Sache' rather than 'Person'. For 1 Cor. 1⁹ has the same construction of *κοινωνία* with objective genitive of the person (Christ). Actually St. Paul thought of the Holy Spirit both as divine substance and as divine person, sometimes passing suddenly from one to the other as in 1 Cor. 12¹¹⁻¹³.

Hauck's comments on Acts 2⁴² are valuable (pp. 809-810). He will not allow that *ἡ κοινωνία* here means concretely the community—the fellowship of Christians. The Christians were as yet

only a circle of believers within the Jewish community. Moreover the phrase can scarcely mean the community of goods described in v. 44. His own view is expressed as follows: 'mehr abstrakt, geistig die Gemeinschaft des brüderlichen Zusammenhaltens, das sich im Gemeindeleben bewährt und auswirkt.' It is not easy to suggest an adequate English rendering of these words. But the main thought seems sufficiently clear. The *koinonia* is not the Church as a visible society nor any particular external manifestation of the Church's unity. It is rather an interior spiritual reality, an activity of sharing or communion, constituting the inner bond of that brotherly concord which, in turn, is realized and expressed in the life of the community. This interpretation of Acts 2⁴² corresponds well with Hauck's account of 2 Cor. 13¹³⁽¹⁴⁾ and Phil. 2¹. In the latter text *κοινωνία πνεύματος* is rendered by 'Gemeinschaft am Geiste'. The subjective genitive is again explicitly ruled out. These texts refer to participation in the Spirit and 'not a fellowship which the Spirit brings about' (p. 807).

Accordingly Hauck refrains from any suggestion that ἡ κοινωνία in Acts 2⁴² should be regarded as the Greek equivalent of חֲבֻרָה (*habûrah*). This is all the more remarkable as (1) he has shown in detail the close correspondence of the two roots in biblical and Jewish literature, and (2) he quotes Acts 2⁴⁶ as describing the early Christian counterpart of the Jewish *habûrah* meals (p. 803). This careful treatment of the subject compares favourably with the curious handling of Acts 2⁴² by some modern scholars. A recent example is to be found in *The Early Eucharist*, by F. L. Cirlot. The author takes for granted that ἡ κοινωνία in that passage means 'the fellowship of the Apostles' although there is no ground for this in the original Greek. He then concludes that the phrase 'presumably is the nearest equivalent Greek expression for "the *Haburah* of which the Apostles were the heads"' (p. 22). This is to move far from the thought of the New Testament, where the Lord Jesus, both before and after his death and resurrection, is the only known head of the visible fellowship of disciples. It is also to move far from the thought of Acts 2⁴², where the only mention of the apostles is in connexion with their teaching. 'The teaching of the apostles' was about the Lord Jesus Christ; and the *habûrah* which the Lord gathered round him had its bond and centre in him alone. He was its sole head; and its significance lay precisely in 'the *koinonia*', that is, 'the participation' whereby all partook of his Spirit and so shared one life with their Head.

A LIST OF GREEK WORDS AND THE N.T.
PASSAGES IN WHICH THEY OCCUR

κοινός	Mark 7 ^{2,5} ; Acts 2 ⁴⁴ , 4 ³² , 10 ^{14,28} , 11 ⁸ ; Rom. 14 ¹⁴ (<i>twice</i>); Tit. 1 ⁴ ; Heb. 10 ²⁹ ; Jude ³ ; Rev. 21 ²⁷
κοινός	Matt. 15 ¹¹ (<i>twice</i>), 18 ²⁰ (<i>twice</i>); Mark 7 ¹⁵ (<i>twice</i>), 18 ^{20,23} ; Acts 10 ¹⁵ , 11 ⁹ , 21 ²⁸ ; Heb. 9 ¹³
κοινωνέω	Rom. 12 ¹³ , 15 ²⁷ ; Gal. 6 ⁶ ; Phil. 4 ¹⁵ ; 1 Tim. 5 ²² ; Heb. 2 ¹⁴ ; 1 Pet. 4 ¹³ ; 2 John ¹¹
κοινωνία	Acts 2 ⁴² ; Rom. 15 ²⁶ ; 1 Cor. 1 ⁹ , 10 ¹⁶ (<i>twice</i>); 2 Cor. 6 ¹⁴ , 8 ⁴ , 9 ¹³ , 13 ¹³⁽¹⁴⁾ ; Gal. 2 ⁹ ; Phil. 1 ⁵ , 2 ¹ , 3 ¹⁰ ; Philem. 6; Heb. 13 ¹⁶ ; 1 John 1 ³ (<i>twice</i>), 6 ⁷
κοινωνικός	1 Tim. 6 ¹⁸
κοινωνός	Matt. 23 ³⁰ ; Luke 5 ¹⁰ ; 1 Cor. 10 ^{18,20} ; 2 Cor. 1 ⁷ , 8 ²³ ; Philem. 17; Heb. 10 ³³ ; 1 Pet. 5 ¹ ; 2 Pet. 1 ⁴
μετέχω	1 Cor. 9 ¹⁰ , 10 ^{17,21,30} ; Heb. 2 ¹⁴ , 5 ¹³ , 7 ¹³
μετοχή	2 Cor. 6 ¹⁴
μέτοχος	Luke 5 ⁷ ; Heb. 1 ⁹ , 3 ^{1,14} , 6 ⁴ , 12 ¹⁸
συνκοινωνέω	Eph. 5 ¹¹ ; Phil. 4 ¹⁴ ; Rev. 18 ⁴
συνκοινωνός	Rom. 11 ¹⁷ ; 1 Cor. 9 ²³ ; Phil. 1 ⁷ ; Rev. 1 ⁹
συνμέτοχος	Eph. 3 ⁸ , 5 ⁷

INDEX

Apart from some LXX citations, the numbering of chapters and verses follows RV.

References, etc., in the footnotes are indicated by the letters 'n' or 'nn' following the page number, or preceding a series of pages.

(i) REFERENCES

	PAGES		PAGES		PAGES
Genesis (Gen.)		17 ¹⁰⁻²⁷	236	11 ⁴⁵	363n
215, 267, 268, 277		18 ¹⁻¹⁵	236	16	373n, 375, 392
ch. 1	201n, 216	18 ¹⁴ 236 & n, 237n, 238,		16 ²	37n
1 ¹⁻²⁴	277n	240n, 278 & n		16 ¹¹⁻¹⁵	387n
1 ¹	216n, 293, 299n	22 ^{3, 12, 16}	246n	16 ^{18, 19}	387n
1 ²	217n	22 ^{8, 12}	409n	26 ^{11, 12}	13, 315n
1 ³	284	28 ¹¹	299n		
1 ^{5, 8, 10}	277n	32 ²	299n	Numbers (Num.)	
1 ⁷	91			9 ¹²	420n
1 ^{26, 27} 172n, 223 & n, 358n		Exodus (Exod.)		14 ¹⁶	333n
378n, 437n		1 ¹⁹	197n	19	171n
2 ^{2, 8}	382n	4 ^{22, 23}	196n, 363n	21 ⁹	247n
2 ⁷ 218 & n, 267n, 268n,		4 ²² 51n, 134n, 173n, 204n			
437n		12 ^{5, 7}	406	Deuteronomy (Deut.)	
2 ¹⁰	91	12 ⁴⁶	420n		445
2 ¹⁸⁻²⁰	378n	13 ²¹	315n	6 ¹⁶	381n
2 ^{19, 20, 23}	277n	14 ^{19, 24}	315n	8 ²	381n
2 ^{19, 20}	358n	19 ⁴⁻⁶	363n	8 ³	368
2 ²⁰⁻³²⁰	222	19 ^{5, 6}	195n	12 ⁹	382n
2 ²⁰⁻³¹⁶	224	19 ⁵	185n	31 ¹⁸	224n
2 ²⁰⁻²⁴	233 & n	19 ⁶	169n, 363	32 ¹⁶⁻²¹	322n
2 ²⁴	223n, 224, 255n	24	392, 393		
3 ¹⁻¹⁵	247n	24 ⁵	393	Joshua (Josh.)	382
3 ¹³	224n	24 ⁸	392, 393	11 ²²	382n
3 ¹⁴⁻¹⁹	223	25 ⁸	315n	21 ⁴⁴	382n
3 ¹⁴	251n	25 ⁴⁰	375n, 390	23 ¹	382n
3 ¹⁸⁻¹⁹	182n	27 ¹⁻⁸	387n		
3 ¹⁶	224	28 ^{4, 6-12}	374n	Judges	
4 ¹⁰	385n	28 ^{29, 30}	377n	6 ¹³	240n
5 ^{22, 24}	163n	29 ⁴²⁻⁴⁶	315n	9 ²⁷	324n
12 ³	48n, 50n	29 ⁴³⁻⁴⁵	13		
14	374	32 ¹⁻⁶	341n	1 Samuel (Sam.)	
14 ¹⁸	393	33 ⁹	315n	2 ¹⁸	374n
15 ⁵	52n	34 ¹⁴⁻¹⁶	224n	4 ⁴	360n
15 ⁶	48n, 237n	40 ^{34, 35}	37n, 315n	9 ^{16, 10^{1, 6, 10}}	140n
15 ⁷⁻²¹	393	40 ³⁵	320	14 ²⁹	105n
17, 18	236, 237 & n			16 ¹¹⁻¹³	140n
17 ⁴	52n	Leviticus (Lev.)	199n		
17 ¹⁵⁻¹⁸	236	8 ^{2, 12, 10⁷}	140n	2 Samuel	
17 ¹⁷	237n	11 ⁴⁴	363	6 ¹⁴	374n

	PAGES		PAGES		PAGES
7	140n, 401	33 ⁶	201n, 216	Ecclesiastes	242
7 ¹	382n	34, 36	344n		
7 ⁸⁻¹⁷	271	34 ⁸	105n, 344	Isaiah (Isa.)	
7 ¹¹	382	36 ⁸⁻⁹	104	54, 56n, 108, 200, 201,	
7 ¹²⁻¹⁶	271n, 374	36 ^{8, 9}	91	362, 371	
7 ¹³	374	40	383	5 ⁷	144n
7 ¹⁴	271n, 291n, 376	41 ⁹	231, 350, 351 & n,	6	360, 367n
			352	6 ⁸⁻⁷	361n
1 Kings		44 ²²	55n	6 ⁸	241n
1 ^{34, 39}	140n	45	140n	6 ¹³	144n
8	374	46	360n	11	140n, 406n
8 ⁵	374n	46 ¹⁻³	239n	11 ¹⁻⁹	359n
8 ^{10, 11}	37n	46 ^{4, 5}	90	11 ¹⁻⁵	217
8 ¹²	176n	52 ⁸	61n	11 ^{1, 2}	413n
8 ^{22ff}	374n	65	91n	11 ¹	144n
8 ⁵⁴⁻⁶⁴	374n	65 ⁹⁻¹³	91	11 ²	37n, 86n, 137n, 161n,
8 ⁶⁶	382n	69 ⁹	317		179n, 218n
11 ²	255n	72	140n, 273, 359n,	11 ⁴⁻⁹	384n
18 ³⁸	477n	72 ¹⁷	384n	11 ⁴	383n, 407
19 ⁸	246n	74 ¹²⁻¹⁹	50n, 140n, 273n	32, 33	90
19 ^{15, 16}	140n	80 ^{1, 2}	360n	32	359n
22	160n	80 ⁸⁻¹¹	360n	32 ¹⁵⁻¹⁸	90
		82	144n	33 ^{20, 21}	90
2 Kings		82	403n	35	359n
4 ¹⁻⁷	319n	82 ⁶	403n	35 ⁸	359
9 ¹⁻⁶	140n	89	140n	40 ³	217n, 409n, 417n
11 ¹²	140n	89 ¹⁹⁻³⁷	140n	40 ⁸⁻⁸	200n
18 ⁶	255n	89 ²⁶	401	40 ¹¹	416n, 417n
		89 ²⁷	291	40 ¹³	111
1 Chronicles (Chron.)		89 ³⁰⁻³²	381n	41 ⁴	296n
15 ²⁷	374n	89 ^{50, 51}	36n	41 ⁸⁻²⁰	417n
		93 ^{4, 5}	360n	41 ⁸	54n, 226, 373
Job	242	95-100	360n	41 ¹⁸	417n
15 ³⁵	205n	95	381, 382	42 ¹	140n, 141n, 142n,
42 ²	237n	95 ⁸	381		175n, 217n, 246n,
		95 ¹¹	382n		247n, 409n
Psalms (Ps. or Pss.)		99 ¹	360n	43 ²¹	185n
1 ³	82n	103 ¹⁰	176n	44 ^{3, 4}	89
2	140n, 217 & n, 270,	104, 105	360	44 ⁸	85n
	271, 290, 374	104 ²⁴	293n	44 ^{8, 48¹²}	296n
2 ^{2, 6}	271	110	373 & n, 374, 376	49	406
2 ^{6, 7}	217	110 ¹	376 & n, 378	49 ¹⁻¹³	417n
2 ⁷	141n, 226n, 271 & n,	110 ³	373 & n	49 ²	134n, 383n
	272n, 376	110 ⁴	373, 374	49 ¹⁰	406 & n, 416n,
7 ¹⁴	205n	147 ¹⁸	216		417n
8	379n			50 ¹	224n
8 ⁴⁻⁸	378n	Proverbs (Prov.)		50 ^{8, 9}	55
8 ⁴	379n	8	291	50 ⁸	54, 56n, 227n
8 ⁶	378, 379n	8 ²²⁻³¹	111n	52 ^{13ff}	252n
16	259n	8 ^{22, 30}	293n	52 ^{13-53³}	251n
16 ¹⁰	259n, 318	8 ²²	291, 293 & n, 299n	52 ¹³	250, 252n
22 ¹	402	8 ³⁰	293n	52 ¹⁴	251n
		9 ¹⁻⁶	338n	52 ^{15, 53¹}	279

INDEX: REFERENCES

455

PAGES		PAGES		PAGES	
53	53 & nn, 54, 217n, 225, 252n, 257, 382n, 417n 250n	32 ¹⁷ , 27 32 ¹⁷	237n, 240n 240n	Zechariah (Zech.)	
53 ¹		Ezekiel (Ezek.)		8 ⁶	237n
53 ⁶ , 7, 12		I	362, 371, 421	12 ¹⁰	420
53 ⁸		1 ¹⁻³	360, 367n	13 ¹	172n, 420
53 ⁷	55, 406	1 ²⁴	360	13 ⁷	281n, 371n
53 ⁹	258	2 ⁸⁻³ , 3 ¹⁴	406n	14 ⁶⁻¹¹	359n
53 ¹⁰⁻¹²	406	9-11, 11 ²³	371n	14 ⁸	91n, 320n
53 ¹⁰ , 11	165n	10	360	Malachi (Mal.)	
53 ¹⁰	372n, 422n	10 ¹ , 11 ²²	361	1 ⁷ , 12	326n
53 ¹¹ , 12	349n	10 ² , 6, 7	360n	2 ¹⁰	134n, 173n
53 ¹¹	54, 55 & n, 56n, 134n, 310n	15 ⁶	361n	3 ¹⁷	185n
53 ¹²	53n, 55n, 167n, 168n, 229n, 329n, 351n	16, 23	144n	Judith	
54 ¹⁻⁸	223n	36 ²⁵⁻²⁷	223n	9 ⁸	276n
54 ⁵	224n	37 ¹⁻¹⁴	277	Wisdom of Solomon	
54 ¹³	353n	37 ⁴⁻⁶ , 11-14, 37 ¹² , 13	277n	(Wisd.)	111
55	359n	37 ¹¹	281n	1 ⁷ , 8 ¹	299n
55 ¹	203n	37 ¹³	281n	7 ²¹	293n
55 ⁸	179n	43 ¹⁻⁹ , 43 ³	360	7 ²²⁻⁹	111n
55 ¹¹	201n, 238n	47 ¹⁻¹²	91n	7 ²² , 9 ¹³ , 17	112
57 ¹⁵	223, 361, 367n	47 ¹	320n	11 ⁴	338n
59 ⁴	205n	Daniel (Dan.)		12 ²¹	403n
61	140n, 141, 217, 359n	2 ²⁰⁻³⁰	176n	16 ⁶ , 7	247n
61 ^{1ff}	414n	7, 7 ⁹	406n	18 ¹⁵ , 16	383, 407n
61 ¹	137n, 165n, 218n, 285, 434	Hosea (Hos.)	226n	Ecclesiasticus (Ecclus.)	
62 ⁴ , 5	224n	1-3, 2 ¹⁵	223n		108
63 ¹⁶	134n	2 ⁵	223	1 ¹⁰	108n
64 ⁴	108n	2 ¹⁶⁻²³	224n	2 ⁸ , 19 ²	255n
65, 66	192n	6 ²	257, 317n	15 ³	337n, 344n
65 ^{17ff}	189n, 359n	10 ⁸	239n	24 ⁴ , 8, 10	315n
66 ²²	189n	11 ¹	51n, 134n, 196n, 223n, 363n	2 Maccabees (Macc.)	
Jeremiah (Jer.)		14 ²	392	7 ²⁸	398n
	89, 90, 362	14 ⁶	61n	St. Matthew (Matt.)	
2 ³	223n	14 ⁸	144n		228, 349, 351n, 354
2 ³	204	Joel	85, 87, 88, 89, 90, 141, 192, 193	1 ²⁰	436n
2 ¹³	82n, 89	2 ²⁷ , 28	90, 141n	3 ⁹	174n, 210n
2 ²¹	144n	2 ²⁷	85	3 ¹²	249n
3	223n	2 ²⁸⁻³²	85n	3 ¹³⁻¹⁵	56n
7 ¹⁻¹⁵ , 7 ¹¹	317n	2 ²⁸	192n	3 ¹⁵	227
11 ¹⁶	61n, 144n	2 ³²	193n	3 ¹⁷	141n, 175n, 246n
15 ¹⁵⁻¹⁸	371	3 ¹⁸	91n	4 ¹ , 7	381n
15 ¹⁶	435	Amos		4 ¹	127n
17 ⁷ , 8, 13	82n	3 ⁷	176n	4 ⁴	368
17 ¹³	89	Jonah		4 ²¹	277n
31 ⁹	204n	1 ¹⁷	257	5 ³	362n
32	240n			5 ⁶	203n, 368 & n
32 ¹⁷⁻²³	240n, 360n			5 ¹⁴⁻¹⁶	208n

	PAGES		PAGES		PAGES
5 ²¹⁻²⁶	166n	28 ^{5, 8}		11 ¹⁻²⁴	239n
5 ^{44, 45}	176n	28 ⁸	282nn	11 ¹¹⁻²¹	235n
6 ^{9, 10}	364n	28 ^{9, 28¹⁷}	283nn	11 ^{22, 23}	235, 236
6 ⁹	358n			11 ²²	238
6 ¹³	365n, 381n	St. Mark	42n, 119, 228,	11 ²³	239n, 240
6 ^{19ff, 33}	368n		346-352, 354, 355	11 ²⁴	239n
6 ²³	203n	1 ^{8, 110}	86nn	12 ¹⁻⁹	51, 246n
6 ²⁵⁻³⁴	368n	1 ^{10, 11}	137n	12 ²⁻⁶	402n
7 ²⁴⁻²⁷	243n	1 ¹¹	141n, 142n, 175n,	12 ⁷	184n
10 ^{40, 42}	40n		217n, 228n, 247n,	12 ^{24, 25}	264n
11 ^{8, 10}	415n		292, 401n	12 ²⁵⁻³⁷	271n
11 ^{25, 26}	358n	1 ¹²	362n	12 ⁴¹⁻⁴⁴	30n
11 ²⁶	175n	1 ²⁰	277n	14 ¹⁻¹⁷	348n
11 ^{28, 29}	382n	2 ¹⁹	224	14 ²	347n
12 ⁶	318n	2 ²⁸	382n	14 ^{3, 14¹⁸⁻²¹}	348
12 ^{18ff}	175n	3 ²²⁻³⁰	362n	14 ^{10, 18, 21}	341n
12 ¹⁸	246n	3 ²⁷	153n	14 ¹⁷⁻²²	332n
12 ²⁸	362n	4	241	14 ²²	330n, 332n, 335n
12 ⁴³⁻⁴⁵	171n	4 ^{4, 15}	207n	14 ²⁴	310n, 349n, 354n,
16 ^{17, 18}	243n	4 ^{5, 6}	82n		392
16 ¹⁷	269n	4 ¹¹	242	14 ²⁵	346, 349, 355, 369
17 ⁵	175n, 246n, 247n,	4 ^{18, 19}	206n	14 ^{27, 28}	349
	320	4 ³⁰⁻³²	240	14 ²⁷	281n, 371n
17 ¹⁴⁻²⁰	239n	6 ^{5, 6}	239n	14 ³⁶	119, 358n, 402
17 ²⁰	238, 240	6 ^{35, 39}	352n	14 ³⁸	20n, 443
18	40n	6 ^{55, 63⁹}	333nn	14 ⁵⁸	317n
18 ¹⁻⁴	203n, 241	6 ⁶¹	332n, 352n	14 ⁶¹⁻⁶⁴	
18 ⁴	203n	7 ¹⁴⁻²³	11	15 ³²	271n
18 ⁷⁻⁹	341n	7 ³¹⁻³⁷	242, 359	15 ³⁴	358n, 402
18 ^{19, 20}	358n	8 ^{11-13, 19-26}	242	15 ³⁸	11n
18 ²¹⁻²⁵	30n, 166n	8 ¹⁸	242, 248n	16 ^{5, 8}	282n
19 ²⁶	435	8 ^{27ff}	243 & n		
19 ²⁸	182n, 189 & n, 190	8 ²⁹	241n	St. Luke	
	& n, 191 & n, 192n,	8 ³⁰⁻³⁸	231		86, 347-349, 355
	228 & n, 369n, 388n	8 ³⁴⁻³⁸	249n	15 ²⁻²³	237
20 ²⁰⁻²⁸	228n	8 ³⁸	245, 246	15 ^{13, 14}	447n
20 ^{30, 31}		9 ¹	245	15 ^{18, 20}	236
21 ^{9, 15}	271nn	9 ⁷	292, 320	15 ²⁶⁻³⁸	236-238
21 ¹⁶		9 ^{12, 13}	415n	15 ^{28, 29, 30}	
21 ²¹	239n, 240	9 ¹²	246n	15 ³¹⁻³³	237
21 ²²	239n	9 ¹⁴⁻²⁹	239n	15 ³²⁻³⁵	270
22 ^{3, 4, 8}	277n	9 ²⁴	240	15 ³⁴	237
23 ²³	350n	9 ³¹	229n	15 ³⁵	x, 238, 272n, 320,
25, 25 ¹⁴⁻³⁰	21n	9 ³³⁻³⁵	228n		436n
25 ^{40, 45}	36n, 40n	9 ⁴⁰⁻⁴²	40n	15 ³⁶	238
25 ⁴⁵	341n	10 ⁷	224	15 ^{37, 38}	238, 241, 278n
26 ⁵	347n	10 ¹³⁻¹⁶	203n	15 ³⁷	237n, 241
26 ²⁸	349 & n	10 ¹⁵	214	15 ⁵⁹⁻⁶⁴	447n
26 ²⁸	349	10 ³²⁻⁴⁵	228n	2 ⁸⁻¹⁴	378n
26 ⁵⁸⁻⁶⁸	271n	10 ³³	229n	2 ¹⁴	175n
27 ^{22, 23, 29}	271n	10 ^{35-45, 10³⁸}	228nn	2 ⁴⁹	362n
27 ³⁹⁻⁴⁴		10 ⁴⁵	42n, 230, 310n	3 ¹⁶	228n
27 ⁴⁶	358n	10 ^{47, 48, 11¹⁰}	271n	3 ²²	141n, 175n, 272n

	PAGES		PAGES		PAGES
4 ¹	127 ⁿⁿ	22 ²⁴⁻³⁰	228 ⁿ	I 14-18	212, 213 & n
4 ¹⁶⁻²¹	435	22 ²⁴⁻²⁷	348 ⁿ	I 14, 16	304, 345, 416
4 ²¹	141	22 ²⁴	230	I 14	16n, 38n, 114n, 162,
5 ¹⁻¹¹ , 5 ⁴ , 5	241	22 ²⁸⁻³⁰	348n, 189n		177n, 210, 212, 213,
5 ⁷⁻¹¹	9n	22 ²⁸	381n		246, 249n, 270n, 313n,
5 ^{7, 10}	450	22 ^{29, 30}	349, 369n, 388n		314-317, 318, 320,
5 ^{8, 10, 11}	241	22 ^{42, 43}	249		353, 371, 389, 413,
5 ⁹	241n	22 ⁴⁷⁻⁷¹	271n		416, 439
6 ²⁷⁻³⁸	105n	23 ³⁰	239n	I 15, 30	413n
7 ^{26, 27}	415n	23 ^{34, 46}	358n	I 15	217n, 413
7 ³⁶⁻⁵⁰	166n	23 ³⁴	108n, 386n	I 16-18	209
8 ^{5, 12}	207n	23 ^{35, 23} 36-39	271nn	I 16	127n, 212, 438, 446
8 ^{7, 14}	206n	24	348n	I 17	210, 417n
8 ¹¹	206n, 235, 249	24 ^{4, 5, 24} 8	282nn	I 18	213, 214n, 250, 345,
9 ^{34, 35}	246n, 320	24 ^{11, 12, 24} 11			351, 416, 438n
9 ³⁴	320	24 ¹³⁻³²	283n	I 19	235
9 ³⁷⁻⁴³	239n	24 ^{17ff}	282n	I 21	415n
9 ⁴³	239n, 241n	24 ¹⁷⁻²⁴	281n	I 23	217n, 409n, 417n
10 ²¹	175n, 358n	24 ²¹	34n, 303n, 401n	I 29ff	414, 415
11 ¹⁻¹³	381n	24 ²⁶	332n	I 29-36	217, 227n, 232,
11 ⁵⁻¹³	368n	24 ^{30, 35}	6n		409 & n, 412
11 ¹³	161n, 368n	24 ³⁰	283n	I 29, 36	217n, 409
11 ²⁰	362n	24 ³⁶⁻³⁸	6n	I 29	228n, 303n, 413n,
11 ²⁴⁻²⁶	171n	24 ⁴¹⁻⁴³	24 ⁴⁹		422, 428
11 ⁴²	350n	24 ⁴⁹	6n, 86n, 125, 126,	I 30	217n
12 ³⁵⁻³⁷	198n	24 ⁵³	194	I 31	217
12 ⁴⁹	228n		356nn	I 32-34	217, 413n
12 ⁵⁰	228n, 345n, 346	St. John		I 32, 33	409n
12 ^{58, 59}	166n	162, 208, 351 & n,		I 32	218, 436, 447n
13 ⁶⁻⁹	144n	352, 354, 355, 408,		I 35ff	234
14 ¹¹	329	448		I 38, 39	438n
14 ¹⁵⁻²⁴	338n	227		I 38, 39, 50	435
15 ^{15, 17, 21}	119	234		I 50, 51	248, 249n, 316n
15 ^{19, 21}	120n	I 1-18	162, 208, 209,	I 51	246n
17 ^{5, 6}	239		217, 314	2	241
17 ²⁰	214n	I 1-5	293	218-22	317ff
18 ¹⁵⁻¹⁷	203n	I 1-4	426	218, 23	421n
18 ^{38, 39} , 19 ³⁸	271n	I 1	211, 216n	218	317, 333
20 ³⁴⁻³⁶	264n	I 3-10	213	214-16	235
20 ³⁶	448n	I 3	436	216	317, 362n
22 ³⁻⁶	341n	I 4-9	217	217	235, 317n
22 ^{14ff}	355	I 4	428n	218	235
22 ¹⁴⁻¹⁹	334n	I 5	176n, 248	219-22	235, 317-319
22 ¹⁴	347 & n, 355	I 6-8	413 & n	219	317-319
22 ¹⁵⁻¹⁸	189n	I 8, 15, 17	413	221	314, 318, 320, 410,
22 ^{15, 16}	347	I 11	209		423, 424
22 ¹⁶⁻²⁰	355	I 12-14	209, 416	222	249n, 318, 351n
22 ^{17, 18}	347n	I 12, 13	200, 209ff, 241,	223	213, 214, 353n
22 ¹⁸	349, 355		436nn	3	194
22 ¹⁹	335n, 355	I 12	209-212, 365	31ff	213
22 ^{21, 22}	341n	I 13	205, 211, 212, 215,	31-15	217, 232
22 ²²	406		218	33-14	430
22 ²⁴⁻³⁴	228			33-18	434

	PAGES		PAGES		PAGES
3 ³	213-215, 216n, 218, 433	5 ³⁸	249n	6 ⁶⁴	229n
3 ^{4, 9}	235	5 ⁴¹⁻⁴⁷	247	6 ⁶⁵	353n
3 ⁴	182n, 215	5 ⁴⁵⁻⁴⁷	247n, 432	6 ⁶⁶⁻⁷⁰	365n
3 ⁵⁻⁸	x, 215ff	6 ^{2, 15, 26}	352	6 ^{68, 69}	434
3 ⁵⁻⁷	433, 436n	6 ⁴	333, 421n	6 ⁶⁹	363n
3 ⁵	214, 216, 218, 416, 417	6 ¹⁰	333n, 352	6 ^{70, 71}	353
3 ^{6, 7}	218, 433	6 ^{11, 635, 51}	352	6 ⁷⁰	370n
3 ⁶	218, 219, 431, 443	6 ¹⁴	214, 352	7 ⁵	316n
3 ⁷	216n, 218	6 ²⁶⁻⁵⁹	352-354	7 ¹⁸	248
3 ⁸	218, 219, 229n	6 ^{26, 36}	352	7 ³⁷⁻³⁹	319, 411, 416
3 ⁸	353	6 ²⁶⁻³³	352	7 ^{37, 38}	421n
3 ¹⁰	215	6 ²⁷	352, 368	7 ³⁸	319
3 ¹¹⁻¹⁵	352n	6 ²⁷	352, 368	7 ³⁹	246n, 249, 416, 432
3 ¹²	214, 431, 435	6 ^{27, 49}	333n, 352n	7 ⁴¹⁻⁴³	235n
3 ^{13, 31}	218n, 268n, 352	6 ^{27, 49, 50, 58}	352	7 ⁵⁰⁻⁵²	215
3 ¹³	214, 246, 268, 430 & n, 431, 433	6 ³²	338	8 ¹²	213, 217, 246
3 ¹⁴⁻¹⁶	312n	6 ³³⁻³⁵	352n	8 ¹⁴	219n, 229n
3 ^{14, 15}	241	6 ^{35, 40, 47}	427	8 ²⁶	371n
3 ¹⁴	231, 247 & n, 249-252, 353, 409, 413, 428, 431	6 ³⁶⁻⁴⁸	353	8 ²⁸	247n, 250
3 ¹⁵	247n, 268n, 410	6 ³⁷⁻⁴⁰	367	8 ^{31, 32}	161n, 249
3 ¹⁶⁻²¹	251n	6 ^{37, 39}	353 & n, 364n, 439n	8 ^{33ff}	210n
3 ¹⁶	68n, 120, 175n, 251n, 364n, 367, 409, 443	6 ³⁸	367, 427n	8 ^{37, 51}	249
3 ¹⁷	410	6 ^{39, 40, 54}	425	8 ⁴⁰	320
3 ¹⁹	367	6 ⁴⁰	353, 416	8 ^{49, 50, 54}	248
3 ²⁰	436	6 ⁴¹⁻⁴⁴	353n	8 ⁵⁸	403n
3 ²⁹	224	6 ^{41, 42}	432	9 ⁵⁻⁷	246
3 ^{31, 32}	214	6 ⁴⁴	353n, 437	9 ⁵	247n
3 ³¹	214n, 433	6 ⁴⁵	353n	9 ^{29, 30}	229n
3 ^{34, 35}	416	6 ⁴⁶	416	10 ¹⁻¹⁸	417
4 ¹⁰⁻¹⁵	352n, 411, 416	6 ⁴⁶	416	10 ¹⁻⁶	417n
4 ¹⁴	162n	6 ⁵¹⁻⁵⁸	389, 424	10 ^{4, 7-9, 11}	417
4 ²²	24	6 ⁵¹⁻⁵⁵	354	10 ^{10, 28, 26-30}	418, 423
4 ^{23, 24}	411, 414	6 ^{51, 55}	422	10 ^{14, 15}	439n
4 ²⁴	433	6 ^{51, 57, 58}	431	10 ¹⁶	410
4 ²⁴	xi, 203n, 367n, 370n, 428	6 ^{51, 58}	430	10 ^{17, 18}	318 & n
5	246	6 ⁵¹	353, 354, 369, 422, 423, 426n	10 ¹⁸	364
5 ^{17, 23}	403n	6 ⁵²	432	10 ²⁷⁻³⁰	418
5 ¹⁷	385n, 387n	6 ⁵³	422, 427n	10 ^{27, 28, 29, 30}	162n
5 ²¹⁻²³	247	6 ⁵⁴⁻⁵⁸	351, 427	10 ²⁸	403
5 ²¹	268n, 436n	6 ⁵⁴	423	10 ^{30-36, 1033}	403, 439n
5 ^{22, 27}	246	6 ^{56, 57}	354, 423, 425	10 ³⁶⁻³⁸	366
5 ^{24, 25}	248	6 ⁵⁶	423, 430, 438n	10 ³⁶	363n, 366
5 ^{25, 524}	436	6 ⁵⁷	423n, 425-430, 436	10 ^{37, 38}	368n
5 ²⁶	367n	6 ⁶⁰⁻⁶³	389	11 ⁴	248
5 ³⁰		6 ⁶⁰	215	11 ²⁵	297n, 426 & n
		6 ^{62, 63}	268n, 354n, 430	11 ³³⁻³⁸	370
		6 ⁶²	352, 430 & n, 431, 432	11 ³³	370n
		6 ^{63, 68}	434	11 ⁴⁰	248n, 249n, 316n
		6 ⁶³	145n, 248, 431-438, 436n, 442-448	11 ⁴¹	358n
		6 ^{64, 70, 71}	352n	11 ⁴⁹⁻⁵²	439n
				12	251, 252n, 353 & n
				12 ¹⁻²⁸	252n

	PAGES		PAGES		PAGES
I2 ¹⁻¹¹	348 <i>n</i>	I4 ²⁻⁶ , I4 ³	418	I7 ⁶	363, 365
I2 ¹	421 <i>n</i>	I4 ^{6, 9}	365	I7 ^{8, 14}	371 <i>n</i>
I2 ¹⁶	249 <i>n</i> , 351 <i>n</i>	I4 ⁶	311 <i>n</i> , 411, 417,	I7 ⁸	435
I2 ²⁰⁻⁵⁰	231		426 & <i>n</i>	I7 ^{9, 10}	364
I2 ²³⁻⁵⁰	249	I4 ⁹	416	I7 ^{11, 14}	229
I2 ²³⁻⁴³	247	I4 ^{12, 28}	348 <i>n</i>	I7 ¹¹	363
I2 ²³	249, 252 <i>n</i>	I4 ¹²	368 <i>n</i> , 418 <i>n</i> , 432	I7 ¹⁴⁻¹⁹	395 <i>n</i>
I2 ²⁴⁻²⁶	249 <i>n</i>	I4 ¹⁵⁻²⁴	419	I7 ¹⁴	365, 395 <i>n</i>
I2 ²⁴	249, 431	I4 ^{17, 19}	419	I7 ^{15, 17}	365 <i>n</i>
I2 ^{27, 28}	358 <i>n</i> , 402	I4 ¹⁷	412, 419 & <i>n</i> ,	I7 ¹⁷⁻¹⁹	430 <i>n</i>
I2 ²⁷	249, 370		437 <i>n</i>	I7 ^{17, 19}	366 <i>n</i>
I2 ³¹	248	I4 ¹⁹	419, 426 <i>n</i>	I7 ¹⁷	365
I2 ³²⁻³⁴	250	I4 ²⁰	419, 423 & <i>n</i> , 438	I7 ^{18, 19}	366
I2 ^{32, 34}	247 <i>n</i>	I4 ²⁶	160	I7 ⁸	126, 368, 427 <i>n</i> , 444
I2 ³²	251 <i>n</i> , 252 <i>n</i> , 353,	I4 ²⁷	388 <i>n</i>	I7 ¹⁹	371, 380 <i>n</i>
	364 <i>n</i>	I4 ²⁸	418	I7 ^{20ff}	364 <i>n</i> , 368
I2 ³³	247 <i>n</i>	I4 ^{30, 31}	365	I7 ²⁰⁻²⁶	443
I2 ³⁴⁻³⁶	252, 399	I4 ³⁰	108 <i>n</i>	I7 ²⁰⁻²³	439
I2 ³⁵⁻⁵⁰	251	I5 ¹⁻⁸	144 <i>n</i> , 245, 302 <i>n</i> ,	I7 ^{22, 23}	438, 439 <i>n</i>
I2 ³⁵	248		364	I7 ²³	364, 439
I2 ³⁸	250 <i>n</i>	I5 ¹	319 <i>n</i>	I7 ²⁵	370 <i>n</i>
I2 ³⁹⁻⁴¹	252	I5 ²	167 <i>n</i>	I8, 19	421
I2 ⁴³		I5 ³	244, 437	I8 ²⁸	421 <i>n</i> , 422
I2 ⁴⁹	371 <i>n</i>	I5 ⁴⁻⁷	423 <i>n</i>	I8 ^{36, 37}	214 <i>n</i>
I3-21	230	I5 ⁵	281 <i>n</i>	I8 ³⁷	311 <i>n</i>
I3 ^{ff}	348	I5 ⁷	2, 368	I9	420, 424
I3 x, 229, 243 <i>n</i> , 348, 354		I5 ¹¹⁻¹⁶⁴	348 <i>n</i>	I9 ^{2, 3, 12, 14, 15, 21}	271 <i>n</i>
I3 ¹⁻²⁰	354	I5 ¹⁵⁻²⁵	365 <i>n</i>	I9 ¹¹	214 <i>n</i>
I3 ¹⁻²⁰	230, 348 <i>n</i>	I5 ¹⁵	371 <i>n</i>	I9 ^{14, 15}	421
I3 ¹⁻³	229, 230, 348 <i>n</i>	I5 ^{18, 19}	365 <i>n</i>	I9 ¹⁵	421 <i>n</i>
I3 ¹	229, 230	I5 ²⁶	411 <i>n</i> , 422	I9 ¹⁷	446 <i>n</i>
I3 ^{2, 11, 18}	231	I6 ⁸⁻¹⁵	418	I9 ³⁰	372, 377 <i>n</i> , 384 <i>n</i> ,
I3 ³	230	I6 ^{8, 17, 28}			416, 422
I3 ⁶⁻¹⁰	231	I6 ^{5, 10, 28}	348 <i>n</i>	I9 ³¹⁻²⁰¹²	423
I3 ^{8-11, 13⁸}	232	I6 ^{12, 13ff}	432	I9 ³¹⁻³⁷	409 <i>n</i> , 420 <i>ff</i>
I3 ¹⁰	166 <i>n</i> , 437	I6 ¹³⁻¹⁵	411, 414	I9 ^{31, 38, 40}	318 <i>n</i>
I3 ¹¹	229 <i>n</i> , 231	I6 ^{14, 15}	412, 419	I9 ^{31, 42}	421 <i>n</i>
I3 ¹²⁻¹⁷	348 <i>n</i>	I6 ¹⁴	160, 249	I9 ³¹	422, 423
I3 ¹³⁻¹⁷	230, 231	I6 ²⁰⁻²²	348 <i>n</i>	I9 ³⁴	353, 414, 423
I3 ^{18, 19}	231	I6 ²²	349, 354	I9 ^{35, 36}	422
I3 ^{18, 13²⁷⁻³⁰}	351	I6 ²³⁻²⁷	358 <i>n</i>	I9 ³⁶	420 <i>n</i>
I3 ¹⁹	230, 231	I6 ³²	371	I9 ³⁷	409 <i>n</i>
I3 ²¹	231, 370	I6 ³³	348, 349	I9 ³⁸⁻⁴²	215
I3 ²³	213 <i>n</i>	I7	358 & <i>n</i> , 367, 443	I9 ^{38, 40, 42}	423
I3 ²⁵	438 <i>n</i>	I7 ¹⁻⁵	250, 410	20	348, 425
I3 ^{26, 27, 28}	351 <i>n</i>	I7 ¹	249 <i>n</i> , 250	20 ^{8, 9}	318
I3 ³⁰	231, 341 <i>n</i> , 354	I7 ^{2, 5}	363	20 ⁸	282 <i>n</i>
I3 ^{31, 32}	250 <i>n</i>	I7 ³	162 <i>n</i>	20 ¹¹⁻¹⁶	282 <i>n</i>
I3 ³¹	249 <i>n</i> , 370	I7 ^{4, 5}	250	20 ¹²	318 <i>n</i> , 423
I3 ^{33, 36}	418	I7 ⁴	377 <i>n</i>	20 ¹⁴⁻¹⁷	283 <i>n</i>
I3 ^{38, 14¹}	371 <i>n</i>	I7 ⁵	246, 427, 431, 440	20 ^{15, 16}	
I4-16	93	I7 ⁶⁻⁸	364 <i>n</i>	20 ¹⁷	xi, 283 <i>n</i> , 358, 386,
I4 ^{2, 10, 17, 28}	438 <i>n</i>	I7 ^{6, 7, 8}	367		401, 402, 403 <i>n</i> , 430 <i>n</i>

	PAGES		PAGES		PAGES
20 ¹⁸	259n	2 ⁴²	ix, xiv, 4, 5, 31, 33,	13 ³³	
20 ¹⁸⁻²⁸	448n		70, 72-76, 76n, 156,	13 ³⁹	272n
20 ¹⁸⁻²³	388n		157, 165n, 234n, 332,	14 ¹ , 16 ^{13, 16}	55n
20 ²¹⁻²³	284n		355, 356 & n, 393,	17	357n
20 ²¹	126, 427, 444		450, 451	17 ^{1-3, 10}	173
20 ²²	416	2 ⁴⁴	6, 73, 451	17 ³	357n
20 ^{24, 25}	282n	2 ⁴⁶	357, 451	17 ⁴	34n
20 ²⁷	283n	3	192n	17 ²⁴⁻²⁹	174n
20 ^{28, 31}	212n	3 ²⁻⁸	359	17 ²⁵⁻²⁸	172
21 ¹⁻¹⁴	425n	3 ²	73n	17 ²⁸⁻²⁹	437n
21 ^{7, 21^{18, 19}}	285	3 ¹³	406	17 ²⁸	115n
21 ²⁰⁻²³	438n	3 ¹⁹⁻²¹	7, 192 & n, 193	18 ¹⁻¹⁸	294
21 ²⁰	438n	3 ¹⁹	192	18 ^{5-8, 18⁷, 18^{19, 26}}	107n
21 ²⁴	351, 413n	3 ²¹	182n	18 ^{24-19⁷}	357n
Acts		4 ²³	356	19 ^{8, 9} }	74
24, 70, 72-75, 85,		4 ^{25, 26}	271n	19 ⁹ }	357n
86, 98, 104, 172,		4 ^{26, 27}	141n	20 ⁷⁻¹²	355
191, 192, 259n,		4 ^{27, 28}	406	20 ²⁸	42n, 185n
301, 355		4 ³¹	357	21 ^{23-27, 29}	357
86n		4 ³²	6, 7, 39, 73, 357	24 ¹⁷	9n, 19n, 24n, 73
6n		4 ^{34-5¹¹}	6		
356 & n		5 ⁴¹	448n	Romans (Rom.)	22,
234n		6 ⁴	356n	52, 58, 177, 273,	
ix		6 ⁵	137n	274, 275, 297, 307,	
192, 193, 194		6 ¹⁴	317n		62
5, 85, 87, 192		7 ³⁸	13, 246n	I-I I	
70 & n, 74		7 ⁴⁴⁻⁴⁷	382n	I ¹	132, 276n, 395
339n		7 ⁴⁸⁻⁵⁰	317n	I ²⁻⁴	270 ff
219n		7 ⁵³	49n	I ^{3, 4}	274, 275, 290, 376
447n		7 ⁵⁵⁻⁸¹	268n	I ³	114n, 268n
192		8 ¹⁴⁻²⁴	74	I ⁴	56n, 272, 273, 290,
6n		8 ^{32, 33}	405		291, 448n
7		8 ³²⁻³⁵	406	I ⁷	276n
85		8 ³⁷	233n	I ⁸	142n, 359n
193n		9 ³⁻⁸	268n	3-8	57
193		9 ²⁰	357n	3 ²⁰⁻⁸	56
98, 406		9 ^{36, 10⁴}	73n	3 ²³⁻²⁶	78, 98
259n		10, I I	10, 62	3 ²³	59n, 79n,
271n		10 ²⁸⁻⁴⁸	234n		110n, 292n, 378n
260n		10 ²⁸	10	3 ²⁴⁻²⁶	56n
197n		10 ³⁸	141n	3 ²⁴	69n, 87n, 142n
260n, 264		10 ⁴¹	6n	3 ^{25, 26}	166n
193		10 ⁴⁴⁻⁴⁸	75	3 ²⁵	59n, 69nn, 166n,
6n, 74n, 75 & n, 85,		10 ^{44, 45}	85		168n, 251n, 447n
86, 87, 126, 137n,		10 ⁴⁵	75n	3 ²⁶	56n
145n, 179n, 194		10 ^{47, 11¹⁵⁻¹⁸}	74	4-6	123n
193n		11 ⁸	16	4, 5	78n
193		11 ¹⁵	70n	4	52, 54, 78, 273
86, 89n		11 ¹⁶	74n	4 ¹¹⁻¹⁷	53
6, 74, 88, 192,		11 ²⁴	137n	4 ¹⁶⁻²⁵	275
193n, 194		12 ¹²	356	4 ¹⁶	173n
357		13 ^{5, 14ff}	357n	4 ¹⁷⁻²⁵	279, 280
		13 ²⁹	260n	4 ¹⁷⁻²²	276, 278
				4 ¹⁷	267n, 276, 277 & n

	PAGES		PAGES		PAGES
4 ¹⁹⁻²¹	278 <i>n</i>	5 ¹⁵⁻²¹	68	7 ¹⁻⁶	130 <i>n</i>
4 ¹⁹	277 <i>n</i>	5 ¹⁵⁻¹⁹	310 <i>n</i>	7 ¹⁻⁴ , 7 ¹⁻³	148 & <i>nn</i>
4 ²⁰	236, 240 <i>n</i>	5 ¹⁵⁻¹⁷	68 <i>n</i>	7 ⁴	56 <i>n</i> , 142 <i>n</i> , 148 & <i>nn</i>
4 ²²⁻²⁵	278	5 ¹⁵	4, 69 <i>n</i> , 273 <i>n</i> , 308	7 ⁷⁻²⁵	128
4 ^{24, 25}	53	5 ¹⁶	69	7 ¹²	129 <i>n</i>
4 ²⁵	53 & <i>n</i> , 54, 55 <i>n</i> , 56 <i>n</i> , 59 <i>nn</i> , 62, 78, 98, 155 <i>n</i> , 166 <i>n</i> , 189, 225, 279, 284, 405 <i>n</i>	5 ¹⁷	59 <i>n</i> , 142 <i>n</i>	7 ¹⁴⁻²⁴	147
5-8	137, 189, 275	5 ^{18, 19}	142 <i>n</i>	7 ¹⁵⁻²⁵	152, 153
5, 6	54, 195 <i>n</i>	5 ¹⁸	59 <i>n</i> , 68, 129 <i>n</i> , 143	7 ^{17, 18, 20}	147
5	78, 87, 96, 98, 274	5 ¹⁹	54, 55, 132, 143, 168 <i>n</i> , 405 <i>n</i>	7 ^{17, 20}	149 & <i>n</i> , 152
5 ¹⁻¹¹	ix, 78-80, 87, 91, 92, 94, 96, 105	5 ²¹	142 <i>n</i> , 143	7 ²⁵	142 <i>n</i> , 152, 153 <i>n</i>
5 ¹⁻⁵	ix, 80, 81, 90, 102	6-8	274	8	101, 127, 135, 183
5 ¹⁻⁴	80, 87, 96	6, 7	128	8 ¹⁻¹⁷	ix
5 ^{1, 2}	78, 79, 92 <i>n</i> , 106 <i>n</i> , 118, 138 <i>n</i> , 279 <i>n</i>	6, 8	122	8 ^{1, 2}	130, 131, 142 <i>n</i>
5 ¹	78 <i>n</i> , 83, 142 <i>n</i>	6	55, 57, 122, 123, 148	8 ¹	56 <i>n</i> , 145 <i>n</i>
5 ²⁻⁹	198	6 ¹⁻¹¹	241 <i>n</i>	8 ²	56 <i>n</i> , 128, 135 <i>n</i> , 145 <i>n</i>
5 ²⁻⁵	101	6 ¹⁻⁵	130	8 ³	128, 129 & <i>n</i> , 268 <i>n</i>
5 ^{2, 3}	103	6 ¹⁻⁴	196	8 ⁴⁻⁹	135, 136, 137, 141
5 ²	79 <i>n</i> , 113, 123, 198, 279 <i>n</i> , 356 <i>n</i>	6 ²⁻⁷	56	8 ^{4, 5}	266
5 ^{3, 4}	79 <i>n</i>	6 ²	147	8 ⁴	129 <i>n</i> , 135 <i>n</i>
5 ^{4, 5}	89	6 ³⁻⁸	59	8 ^{5, 6}	59 <i>n</i>
5 ⁵⁻⁸	96-98, 96 <i>n</i> , 103, 108, 112, 164, 312 <i>n</i>	6 ³⁻⁵	63	8 ^{6, 8}	136
5 ^{5, 6}	96 & <i>n</i> , 212	6 ^{3, 4}	59, 280	8 ⁹⁻³⁰	38 <i>n</i> , 285
5 ⁵	ix, 70 <i>n</i> , 80 & <i>n</i> , 81-91, 93-95, 96-98, 98 <i>n</i> , 103-105, 118, 124 <i>n</i> , 125 & <i>n</i> , 126, 138, 164, 180 <i>n</i> , 319 <i>n</i>	6 ^{3, 6}	130 <i>n</i>	8 ⁹⁻¹⁷	70 <i>n</i>
5 ⁶⁻¹¹	80	6 ³	142 <i>n</i>	8 ⁹⁻¹¹	136, 137
5 ⁶⁻⁸	80, 97-102, 103	6 ⁴	63 & <i>n</i> , 147, 248 <i>n</i>	8 ^{9, 10}	137, 145 <i>n</i> , 153 <i>n</i> , 161, 180 <i>n</i>
5 ^{6, 7}	98	6 ⁵⁻¹¹	144, 145, 147	8 ^{9, 11}	137 <i>n</i> , 138
5 ⁷	99, 106, 110 <i>n</i>	6 ^{5, 6}	56 <i>n</i> , 281 <i>n</i>	8 ⁹	136, 137, 141, 142, 183
5 ⁸	101, 102, 105	6 ^{5, 8, 11, 13}	60	8 ^{10, 11}	261, 265, 267 <i>n</i> , 345 <i>n</i>
5 ⁹⁻¹¹	80, 102, 103	6 ⁵	ix, 61, 62, 63 & <i>n</i> , 102, 121, 125, 135, 144, 274 & <i>n</i> , 275	8 ¹⁰	137, 138, 142-145, 145 <i>n</i> , 167 <i>n</i> , 281 <i>n</i> , 446
5 ^{9, 10}	102	6 ⁶⁻⁸⁴	130 <i>n</i>	8 ¹¹⁻³⁰	x, 188
5 ¹⁰	59 <i>n</i> , 79, 145 <i>n</i>	6 ⁶⁻⁷⁶	130	8 ^{11, 23}	183
5 ¹¹	103 <i>n</i> , 113 <i>n</i> , 142 <i>n</i>	6 ⁶	65 <i>n</i> , 135, 146-149, 153 <i>nn</i> , 281 <i>n</i>	8 ¹¹	183-186, 269 <i>n</i> , 276, 286
5 ¹²⁻⁸	274	6 ^{7, 8}	135 <i>n</i> , 147	8 ¹²⁻¹⁷	184 <i>n</i>
5 ¹²⁻⁸¹⁷	130	6 ⁷	56 <i>n</i> , 130 <i>n</i>	8 ^{12, 13}	135, 137
5 ¹²⁻⁶¹¹	143	6 ⁸⁻¹¹	167 <i>n</i>	8 ¹⁴⁻¹⁷	38 <i>n</i>
5 ^{12ff}	195 <i>n</i>	6 ⁸	142 <i>n</i> , 154 <i>n</i>	8 ¹⁴⁻¹⁶	120, 132
5 ¹²⁻²¹	58, 143, 274	6 ¹⁰	155 <i>n</i>	8 ¹⁴	127, 132, 135 <i>n</i>
5 ¹²⁻¹⁴	143	6 ¹¹	142 <i>n</i> , 154 <i>n</i> , 169 <i>n</i>	8 ^{15, 16}	137 <i>n</i>
5 ¹⁷⁻¹⁹	143	6 ¹²⁻²³	132	8 ¹⁵	119, 132, 134 <i>n</i>
5 ¹²	92	6 ¹²⁻¹⁴	135	8 ^{16, 17}	125
5 ^{13, 14}	58	6 ¹⁶⁻¹⁸	132, 133	8 ¹⁷⁻²⁵	79
5 ¹⁴	59 <i>n</i>	6 ¹⁶	132, 168 <i>n</i>	8 ¹⁷	52 <i>n</i> , 79, 123, 184
		6 ¹⁷⁻²¹	136	8 ^{18ff}	398
		6 ¹⁷	132 & <i>n</i>	8 ¹⁸	184 & <i>n</i> , 187 <i>n</i> , 448 <i>n</i>
		6 ²¹⁻²³	195 <i>n</i>	8 ¹⁹⁻³⁰	182
		6 ²²	42 <i>n</i>	8 ¹⁹⁻²¹	297 <i>n</i>
		6 ²³	69 <i>n</i> , 134 & <i>n</i> , 135 <i>n</i> , 142 <i>n</i>	8 ¹⁹	181 <i>n</i>
		7	ix, 99, 149, 151	8 ^{20, 822}	182 <i>nn</i>

	PAGES		PAGES		PAGES
8 ²¹	182 ⁿ , 187 ⁿ	15 ¹⁻³	22, 42 ⁿ	6 ²	III, 112
8 ²³⁻²⁷	70 ⁿ	15 ¹	43	6 ^{9, 10}	177
8 ^{23, 29}	275 ⁿ	15 ³	30 ⁿ	6 ¹¹	15 ⁿ , 87, 88, 89 & <i>n</i> , 118, 124 ⁿ , 125 ⁿ , 136 ⁿ , 166 ⁿ , 177
8 ²³	181 ⁿ , 182 ⁿ , 183, 184-187, 187 ⁿ , 255, 346 ⁿ , 447 ⁿ	15 ¹³	187 ⁿ	6 ^{12ff}	273
8 ^{24, 25} , 8 ²⁵ , 8 ³⁰	187 ⁿⁿ	15 ¹⁶	19 ⁿ , 23	6 ¹²⁻²⁰	15 ⁿ , 17
8 ²⁸	70 ⁿ , 180 ⁿ	15 ²⁵⁻³¹	9 ⁿ , 24	6 ¹³	264
8 ²⁹	115 ⁿ , 165 ⁿ , 181, 186 ⁿ , 269 ⁿ , 272 ⁿ , 290, 292 ⁿ , 378 ⁿ	15 ²⁶	10 ⁿ	6 ¹⁵⁻¹⁷	254, 442 ⁿ
8 ³¹⁻³⁹	96	15 ^{27, 28}	24, 25, 27 ⁿ	6 ^{15, 19}	289 ⁿ , 319
8 ³¹⁻³⁶	284	15 ²⁷	32 ⁿ , 33 ⁿ	6 ¹⁵	17, 46, 253, 255 ⁿ , 256, 298 ⁿ
8 ³²⁻³⁶ , 8 ³⁶	405 ⁿⁿ	1 Corinthians (Cor.)	14, 42 ⁿ , 253, 274, 275, 288, 291, 297, 307, 319, 322, 335, 355	6 ^{16, 17}	255 ⁿ
8 ³²	55 ⁿ , 101, 102, 123, 175 ⁿ	I-4	14, 22, 137	6 ¹⁷	19, 143 ⁿ , 275, 300 ⁿ
8 ^{33, 34, 36}	55	I-3	255 ⁿ	6 ¹⁸	17
8 ³⁴	165 ⁿ	I ²	15 ⁿ	6 ^{19, 20}	15, 113 ⁿ
9-I I	62	I ⁹	14 ⁿ , 71, 75 ⁿ , 77, 156, 157, 450	6 ¹⁹	136 ⁿ , 315 ⁿ
9 I-13	13 ⁿ	I ¹⁸⁻³⁰	240 ⁿ	6 ²⁰	28, 41 ⁿ , 42 ⁿ
9 ³⁻¹³ , 9 ¹¹	173 ⁿⁿ	I ^{18, 22-24}	106	7	16 ⁿ , 333
10 ¹⁻⁸ , 10 ⁸⁻¹⁰	243	I ²¹	68 ⁿ	7 ^{22, 23}	41 ⁿ , 42 ⁿ , 113 ⁿ
10 ⁹⁻¹¹	279 ⁿ	I ²⁸⁻³¹	113 ⁿ	7 ²⁵⁻³³	7 ⁿ
10 ⁹	244 ⁿ	I ³⁰	106 ⁿ , 145 ⁿ , 203 ⁿ	7 ^{29, 31}	333
10 ¹²	62 ⁿ , 179 ⁿ	I ³¹	106 ⁿ , 113	8-I O	323
11	146	2	ix, 398 ⁿ	8	334
11 ¹⁵⁻²⁴	61	2-5	107	8 ¹⁻⁷	323 ⁿ
11 ¹⁷	61, 144, 274 ⁿ	2 ^{2, 8, 12}	151	8 ^{2, 7-13}	323
11 ²³⁻³²	62 ⁿ	2 ⁶⁻¹⁶	107 ^{ff}	8 ^{5, 6}	324 ⁿ
11 ²⁴	62	2 ⁶⁻⁸	106 ⁿ , 108	8 ⁵	330 ⁿ
11 ²³	179 & <i>n</i>	2 ⁹⁻¹⁶	108-112, 143	8 ⁶	268 & <i>n</i>
12	21 ⁿ , 23, 24, 288, 289	2 ⁹⁻¹²	108, 109	9 ¹	259 ⁿ
12 ^{1, 2}	19-21, 133, 134, 169, 171, 288, 327, 331, 332	2 ¹⁰	109, 179 ⁿ	9 ¹⁰	323 ⁿ
12 ¹	44, 133 ⁿ , 384 & <i>n</i>	2 ¹¹⁻¹⁵	109-111, 266	9 ²³	32 ⁿ
12 ^{2, 3}	113	2 ¹⁴	136 ⁿ , 151	10, 11	331
12 ²	120, 332	2 ¹⁶	107, 111, 112, 143 ⁿ , 151, 313 ⁿ , 337 ⁿ , 344	10	333, 340 ⁿ
12 ³⁻⁶	21, 148 ⁿ	3	14, 15	10 ¹⁻¹⁴	323, 325 ⁿ , 333
12 ^{3, 4}	288 ⁿ	3 ^{1ff}	202	10 ^{1ff}	416
12 ^{4, 5}	46	3 ¹⁻³	61	10 ^{1, 2}	246 ⁿ
12 ⁴	288	3 ^{1, 2}	33 ⁿ	10 ³⁻⁶	333
12 ⁵	47 ⁿ , 148 ⁿ , 288 ⁿ , 310 ⁿ	3 ¹	113	10 ³	352 ⁿ
12 ^{6ff}	307 ⁿ	3 ^{16, 17}	14, 70 ⁿ , 136	10 ⁴	319, 337 & <i>n</i> , 338 ⁿ , 344
12 ⁶	288	3 ¹⁶	315 ⁿ , 318, 319 & <i>n</i>	10 ⁵	337
12 ¹³	10 ⁿ , 21	3 ²¹⁻²³	60, 113	10 ⁷	341 ⁿ
12 ¹⁶	21, 113, 288 ⁿ	3 ²³	151	10 ⁹	338
13 ^{8ff}	180 ⁿ	4 ⁷	24 ⁿ	10 ¹¹	52 ⁿ , 334
13 ¹¹⁻¹⁴	7 ⁿ	5-7	14	10 ¹⁴	328
14, 14 ⁶⁻¹²	22	5 ^{7, 8}	325	10 ¹⁵⁻²²	373
14 ¹⁰	22 ⁿ	5 ⁸	347, 405 ⁿ	10 ¹⁵	335
14 ¹⁴	12 ⁿ	6, 12, 15	257	10 ^{16ff}	449, 450
		6	16 ⁿ , 19, 21, 22, 289	10 ¹⁶⁻²²	322 ^{ff} , 326, 332
		6 ^{1, 2}	15 ⁿ	10 ^{16, 17}	331, 332
				10 ¹⁸	322 ⁿ , 327, 328, 332, 335, 354, 449

	PAGES		PAGES		PAGES
10 ¹⁷	310n, 322 & n, 323 & h, 334, 335 & n, 337, 339n, 342, 449, 450	12 ¹²⁻¹⁴	94	15 ^{24, 51, 15^{48, 49}}	269
10 ¹⁸⁻³³	334	12 ^{18, 14, 20}	288, 310n	15 ²⁶	261n, 269
10 ¹⁸⁻²²	326	12 ^{12, 13}	46, 145n	15 ³¹	55n
10 ¹⁸	13n, 322n, 324, 326, 373	12 ^{12, 27}	255	15 ³⁵	260, 269
10 ¹⁹⁻²² , 10 ³⁰	323nn	12 ¹²	23n, 107n, 148n, 256 & n, 273n, 288, 298n, 318, 319, 331	15 ³⁶⁻³⁸	262, 285
10 ¹⁹⁻²¹	324	12 ¹³	89 & n, 93-95, 118, 124n, 125n, 145n, 256, 319 & n	15 ³⁶	262, 263
10 ²⁰	322n			15 ^{37, 38}	265
10 ²¹	322 & n, 323 & n, 326	12 ¹⁴	256	15 ^{38, 15⁵⁴, 15⁵⁷}	285
10 ²⁶	12n	12 ^{15ff}	95	15 ⁴²⁻⁴⁴	266
10 ³¹⁻³³	323	12 ²¹	47n	15 ^{44, 46}	267 & n
11	334	12 ²⁶	36, 40n, 58n	15 ⁴⁵⁻⁴⁹	182n, 274
11 ³	47n, 222, 273	12 ²⁷	47n, 145n, 256, 288n, 336	15 ^{45, 47}	354n, 433n
11 ⁷⁻⁹	223n	12 ^{28ff}	307n	15 ⁴⁵	59n, 145n, 201n, 218n, 267 & nn, 292n, 319, 437n
11 ⁷	59n, 110n, 292n, 378n, 437n	12 ^{28, 29}	340	15 ⁴⁶	268
11 ¹⁷⁻³⁴	392	12 ²⁸	255, 256, 340n	15 ⁴⁷	218n, 268, 274, 336
11 ¹⁷⁻²²	334	12 ²⁸	238	15 ⁴⁹	60n, 275n
11 ¹⁷	337	14 ¹⁶	392	15 ⁵⁰⁻⁵⁸	7n
11 ^{22, 34}	354	14 ²⁰	203n	15 ⁵⁰⁻⁵⁷	269, 285
11 ²²	341	15	58, 183, 184, 195n, 254, 257n, 258, 261, 265, 266, 275, 278, 279, 285, 286, 291, 301, 433	15 ⁵⁰	269n, 285
11 ²³⁻²⁶	325, 328n	15 ^{1ff}	98, 257ff	15 ⁵³	269nn, 270, 285, 286
11 ²³⁻²⁵	340	15 ¹⁻⁴	278, 325, 355	16 ¹⁻⁴	9n
11 ²³	335n, 341, 354, 355	15 ¹⁻³	98	16 ²²	346n
11 ²⁴⁻²⁶	345	15 ^{1, 2, 15¹}	258n, 279n	2 Corinthians	25, 34, 57, 58, 66, 67
11 ^{24, 25}	361	15 ^{3, 4}	53n, 257, 279n	1 ³⁻⁷	34, 35, 40n, 56, 448n
11 ²⁴	330n, 335, 338, 354n	15 ³	258n, 341	1 ^{3, 4}	34, 401
11 ²⁵	340 & n	15 ⁴	258, 259, 260 & nn, 262, 263, 269	1 ³	359n, 401
11 ²⁶⁻³⁴	333	15 ^{5-8, 15⁸}	259n	1 ⁴⁻⁷	401n
11 ²⁶⁻²⁹	343	15 ⁸⁻¹¹	259	1 ⁵	34, 35 & n, 176n, 305, 330n, 401
11 ^{26, 27}	341	15 ¹²⁻²⁰	260n	1 ^{6, 7}	35
11 ²⁶	346	15 ¹²⁻¹⁹	261	1 ⁸	35n, 448
11 ²⁸⁻³⁴	350n	15 ^{21, 22}	261	1 ¹⁸⁻²²	138-140, 161, 166n
11 ^{29, 31, 32}	350	15 ^{12, 16, 29, 32, 35}	257n	1 ¹⁹	138 & nn, 139n
11 ²⁹	342-345	15 ¹²	260n	1 ²⁰	50, 138n, 358n
11 ^{30, 11³³}	338	15 ^{13-15, 17-19}	260	1 ^{21, 22}	139
11 ³⁴	350n	15 ²⁰⁻²²	59n	1 ²²	187n, 285
12-14	255n	15 ^{22, 23}	60n	2 ¹⁷	286
12	48, 92, 222, 254, 255, 288, 330n	15 ^{22, 45}	261, 276	3 ⁴⁻⁶	153n
12 ³	244n	15 ²²	58, 131n, 143n, 144, 267 & nn, 274	3 ⁶	145n, 267n, 276n
12 ⁴⁻¹¹	93, 288n	15 ²³	183, 262, 266, 268, 336, 337, 345, 379n, 447n	3 ¹⁸	79n, 208, 313
12 ^{8, 9}	93n	15 ²⁴⁻²⁸	377n, 379n	4, 5	276n
12 ¹¹⁻¹³	450			4 ³	252n
12 ¹¹	93 & n, 219n			4 ^{4, 6}	177n
12 ¹²⁻²⁷	58n, 253, 255, 330			4 ⁴	108, 292, 437n
12 ^{12ff}	46			4 ^{6, 7}	311n

	PAGES		PAGES		PAGES
4 ⁶	38n, 208n, 284, 292, 305n	13 ¹¹	67	4 ¹⁻²	115, 186n
4 ⁷⁻¹⁸	284, 448n	13 ¹⁴	ix, 66 & n, 67n, 69, 70, 71 & n, 74-78, 78n, 80, 81, 84n, 156, 157, 160n, 329, 450, 451	4 ^{3, 9}	290n
4 ⁷⁻¹⁵	305n			4 ³	115 & n
4 ⁷	284, 306n, 311n, 317			4 ⁴⁻⁷	ix, 114, 116, 122, 128, 137
4 ¹⁰⁻⁵⁵	285			4 ⁴⁻⁶	121, 122, 164n
4 ¹⁰⁻¹⁸	286	Galatians (Gal.)		4 ^{4, 5}	51, 116, 117, 122, 123, 186n
4 ¹⁰⁻¹⁴ , 4 ¹²⁻¹⁸	284		43, 52, 57, 122, 123, 253, 273	4 ^{4, 6}	126
4 ¹⁰⁻¹²	306n	11 ¹⁴	151	4 ⁴	98n, 117, 122n, 130n, 132n, 268n, 270n
4 ^{10, 11}	55n, 143n, 284	11 ^{15, 16}	175n	4 ⁵	116n, 173n
5 ¹⁻¹⁰	284, 286	11 ¹⁸	269n	4 ^{6, 7}	70n, 115n
5 ¹⁻⁵	7n, 285	2	148	4 ⁶	ix, 114, 116-126, 125n, 132n, 134n, 137n, 187n
5 ¹	284, 285	2 ^{9, 10}	9		
5 ^{2-4, 5} , 5 ⁶⁻¹⁰	285	2 ¹⁵⁻⁴⁷	48		
5 ⁷	286	2 ¹⁵	177n		
5 ^{14ff}	284	2 ^{19, 20}	ix, 56n, 59n, 137, 147-155, 154n	4 ⁷	49n, 51, 119, 125, 184
5 ¹⁴⁻²¹	45	2 ¹⁹	148, 149 & n, 155, 167n	4 ^{8, 9}	115n
5 ^{14, 15}	45, 46, 55n, 56, 274	2 ²⁰	60n, 121, 130n, 142, 149 & n, 153nn, 155 & n, 167nn, 225, 226n, 229n, 241, 314n, 319n, 423	4 ¹⁹	142, 154n
5 ¹⁴	59, 65n, 130n, 148n, 153n, 295, 310n, 316			4 ²¹⁻⁵¹	48
5 ¹⁵	46, 59 & n			4 ²¹	51n
5 ¹⁷	45, 46, 57n, 60n, 65n, 77, 284			4 ²³	114n
				4 ²⁸	51
5 ^{18, 19}	69n			5	122
5 ^{19, 20}	107n	3, 4	13n	5 ⁶	38n, 330n
5 ¹⁹	106n	3	114, 123n	5 ¹⁶⁻²⁶	128
5 ²¹	45, 46, 56n, 57 & n, 59n, 251n, 445	3 ²⁻⁵	124 & n	5 ¹⁶⁻²⁶	70n
		3 ^{2, 3¹⁰⁻²⁵}	116	5 ^{16, 25} , 5 ^{17, 25}	135nn
6 ¹⁴⁻⁷¹	12, 15	3 ³	135n	5 ¹⁸	128, 135n
6 ¹⁴	163n, 450	3 ⁵	145n	5 ²³	110n
6 ¹⁸	13n, 315nn	3 ⁶⁻²⁶	49n	5 ²⁴	154n
6 ¹⁸	9n, 25ff, 39	3 ^{6, 3⁷⁻⁹}	48nn	6 ¹⁻⁵	42, 446
8	42	3 ⁷	124	6 ²	22, 42
8 ¹⁻⁴ , 8 ¹	27	3 ¹³	56n, 57n, 251n, 445	6 ⁵	43
8 ⁴	10n, 27nn	3 ¹⁴	114, 124	6 ⁸	31n, 32
8 ⁵	27, 40, 41n	3 ^{15, 17} , 3 ²⁰	49nn	6 ^{14, 17}	408n
8 ^{6, 7}	27n	3 ¹⁶	50 & n, 54	6 ¹⁴	400
8 ⁹	26, 28, 67, 68, 69, 268n, 298n	3 ^{22, 23}	115n	6 ¹⁵	46n
		3 ²³⁻²⁹	114	6 ¹⁶	13n
8 ¹⁴	29n, 43	3 ²³⁻²⁵	115		
8 ¹⁹	27n	3 ^{23, 25}	115, 116	Ephesians (Eph.)	47, 60, 173, 273, 274, 296, 298, 300, 306n, 307, 308, 386
9 ⁶⁻¹⁵	28, 132n	3 ²⁶⁻²⁹	48, 49, 52, 54, 123		
9 ⁸	176n	3 ^{26, 27}	117, 187n	1 ³⁻¹⁴	x, 173ff, 175n, 182
9 ¹³	10n	3 ²⁶	51, 115 & nn, 117, 124, 132n, 291	1 ³⁻¹⁰	380
10 ¹⁷	113n	3 ²⁷⁻²⁹	49n, 50, 116	1 ³	174, 359n, 401
11 ^{2, 3}	224	3 ^{27, 28}	38n, 55n, 56	1 ^{4, 5}	115n, 174 & n
11 ²	203n	3 ²⁷	59	1 ⁴	174, 186n, 311n
11 ¹⁰ , 13 ³	143n	3 ^{28, 29}	48	1 ⁵⁻¹⁴	174, 175
12 ^{2, 3}	259n	3 ²⁸	49, 57n, 77, 310n	1 ⁵⁻⁷	174, 175n
12 ⁷⁻¹⁰	43n	3 ²⁹	114, 124	1 ^{5, 9}	175 & n
13 ²	142	4 ¹⁻⁷	49n, 114	1 ⁵	181, 182, 186n
13 ¹¹⁻¹⁴	67n				

	PAGES		PAGES		PAGES
I ⁶⁻⁸	181	3 ¹⁷	142, 179, 180 & n, 311 n	I ²⁷ , 2	329
I ^{6, 7}	175, 181	3 ¹⁸	178	2 ¹	67, 70, 71, 74, 75 & n, 84 n, 160 n, 329, 451
I ⁷⁻⁹	176 n	3 ¹⁹	180, 299 n, 306, 307, 442	2 ^{5ff}	268 n
I ^{7, 8}	179 n	3 ^{20, 21}	180	2 ⁵⁻¹¹	68, 132, 270, 329 & n, 383 n, 400
I ^{8, 9}	176	4, 4 ¹⁻⁷	307	2 ⁶⁻⁸	142
I ^{9, 10}	178	4 ¹⁻⁶	441 n	2 ⁷⁻¹¹	56 n, 405 n
I ¹⁰	178, 181, 182 n, 222 n, 296, 308	4 ²	311 n, 312	2 ^{7, 8}	130 n, 132 n, 168 n
I ^{11, 12}	186 n	4 ^{3, 4}	70 n	2 ^{7, 17}	167 n, 330
I ^{13, 14}	185, 186	4 ³	78	2 ⁷	114 n, 122 n, 270 n
I ¹³	179, 187 n, 204 n	4 ⁷	307 n, 309	2 ⁸	167 n
I ¹⁴	185 n, 186 n	4 ^{8-10, 11-14}	307	2 ^{12, 13}	121
I ¹⁵⁻²¹⁰	178	4 ^{9, 4^{11ff}}	307 n	2 ¹³	175 n
I ¹⁷⁻²⁶	181	4 ¹²⁻¹⁶	442	2 ¹⁵	208 n, 311 n
I ¹⁷	176, 179, 306	4 ¹³⁻¹⁶	308, 439 n	2 ^{17, 18}	36 n
I ¹⁸⁻²²	197 n	4 ¹³	64 n, 181 n, 307, 308, 310 n, 317, 439 n	2 ¹⁷	19 n, 23 n, 328-330, 332, 346, 408 n
I ¹⁸	185 n	4 ^{15, 16}	47 n, 311 & n	3 ³	13 n, 50
I ¹⁸⁻²⁸	180 n	4 ¹⁵	308, 311, 312	3 ⁷⁻¹¹	400
I ²⁰⁻²³	307 n	4 ¹⁶	167 n, 308, 309, 312	3 ^{7, 8}	30
I ^{22, 23}	47 n, 222	4 ²¹	311, 411 n	3 ^{10, 11}	286
I ²³	47 n, 304, 306, 307, 310 n	4 ²²⁻²⁴	201 n	3 ¹⁰	33
2	16 n	4 ³⁰	187 n	3 ^{11ff}	346
2 ^{1-10, 23}	181	5 ¹	312	3 ²¹	265, 269 n, 286
2 ²	108 n	5 ²	311 n, 312, 386 n	4 ¹⁰⁻²⁰	44
2 ^{5, 6}	36 n, 60 n	5 ^{7, 11}	13 n	4 ¹⁴⁻¹⁹	33 & n
2 ⁶	307	5 ^{13, 14}	176	4 ¹⁵	10 n, 33 n
2 ¹¹⁻²²	111 n, 170	5 ²¹⁻²³	224, 254	4 ¹⁸	19 n, 25 n, 44
2 ¹²	195 n	5 ²¹⁻²³	221		
2 ¹³⁻¹⁹	181	5 ²²⁻²³	x, 221		
2 ¹⁴⁻¹⁶	62, 308	5 ^{23, 24, 31}	222		
2 ¹⁴	11 n	5 ^{23, 28, 29}	226		
2 ^{15, 16, 220-22}	319 n	5 ²⁵⁻²⁷	221 ff, 231, 232, 279 n, 280	Colossians (Col.)	47, 60, 289 ff, 293, 297, 298, 300, 379, 390
2 ¹⁵	63, 178, 308	5 ²⁵	225, 226 n, 229 n	I	291
2 ¹⁶	12 n, 79 n, 177 n, 356 n	5 ^{26, 27}	227, 313	I ⁹	179 n
2 ¹⁸⁻²²	16	5 ²⁶	232	I ^{12, 13ff}	175 n
2 ^{21, 22}	315 n	5 ²⁸⁻³²	442 n	I ^{13, 14}	181 n, 292
3 ¹⁻⁶	62	5 ³⁰	254	I ^{15ff}	268 n
3 ^{4, 5}	177	5 ^{31, 32}	224, 313 n, 316	I ¹⁵⁻²⁰	178 n, 290, 291
3 ⁴	177, 179 n	5 ³¹	224, 255 n	I ¹⁵⁻¹⁸	201
3 ⁶	32 n, 52 n, 177	6 ¹⁷	382, 407 n	I ¹⁵⁻¹⁷	290, 291, 293 n
3 ⁸⁻¹⁰	297			I ^{15, 16}	178, 181 n, 380 n
3 ⁸	177, 178 & n	Philippians (Phil.)	328	I ¹⁵	289, 292, 437 n
3 ⁹⁻¹²	181 n	I ⁵	31 n, 32	I ^{16, 17}	293 n, 299 n
3 ⁹⁻¹¹	178	I ⁶	102	I ¹⁶	173 n, 293, 296
3 ¹⁰	178, 311	I ^{7, 8}	103 n	I ^{17, 20}	308 n
3 ¹¹⁻¹³	179	I ⁷	79 n	I ¹⁸	47 n, 222 n, 272 n, 289, 290, 291, 292 n, 293, 295, 297, 299, 300
3 ¹²	177 n	I ¹⁸⁻²⁶	286	I ^{19ff}	175 n
3 ¹⁴⁻¹⁹	179, 180, 312	I ¹⁹	145 n	I ^{19, 20}	295
3 ^{14, 15}	181, 221	I ^{23, 24}	286, 346	I ^{19, 20}	295
3 ¹⁶⁻¹⁹	307	I ²⁷⁻²¹⁶	329, 330	I ^{19, 20}	289, 294 n, 306 n
3 ^{16, 17}	145 n	I ^{27, 30}	39		

	PAGES		PAGES		PAGES
1 ¹⁹	293n, 294, 297	4 ³⁻⁵	12n	2 ¹⁴	45, 224n, 226, 384n,
1 ²⁰	305	4 ³	390		389, 449, 450
1 ^{22, 24}	293n, 300, 319n	5 ²²	13n	2 ¹⁶ , 2 ¹⁸	395nn
1 ²²	297, 305	6 ¹⁸	10n	2 ^{17, 18}	401
1 ²³	297	2 Timothy		2 ¹⁷	45, 168n, 373n, 383,
1 ²⁴⁻²¹⁰	306n	2 ^{11, 12}	408		395n, 396, 397, 400n
1 ²⁴	35, 47n, 56n, 300,	2 ¹³	166n	3 ¹⁻⁶	381, 402n
	304-306, 310n, 319n,	4 ⁶	19n, 329n	3 ¹	23n
	329n, 330n, 332, 408n	Titus	191	3 ²	383
1 ²⁷	142, 179, 207, 275,	3 ⁴⁻⁷	86, 87, 190n, 194	3 ⁶ , 3 ⁷⁻⁴¹¹	381
	293n, 301, 304	3 ^{5, 6}	190	3 ⁸	381n
1 ²⁸	293, 300	3 ⁵	190 & n, 191n, 196	3 ¹¹	382n
2 ²⁻⁸	289	3 ⁶	190n	3 ¹⁴	44, 66, 75n, 224n,
2 ³	292, 293n	Philemon	25, 38-43, 40n		226, 381n
2 ^{6, 7, 9}	300	vv. 1, 9	39n	3 ¹⁷	333n
2 ^{6, 11, 20}	293n	v. 6	38, 39	4 ^{3, 4, 4⁹}	385
2 ⁷	180n, 293n	vv. 10-17	39	4 ^{3, 4⁶⁻¹⁶}	382
2 ⁸	289n	vv. 17-19	40, 41	4 ^{11-620, 4^{12, 13}}	383
2 ^{9, 10}	293n, 297, 300,	v. 20	42, 103	4 ¹²	382, 407
	304, 305, 310n	Hebrews (Heb.)		4 ¹⁴⁻¹⁶	377n, 383
	298	44, 202, 281, 344,		4 ¹⁴	377
2 ^{10, 19}	308	372, 373n, 379,		4 ¹⁶	45, 130n, 382
2 ¹⁰	289, 299 & n, 300	404-408, 443		5-7	393
2 ¹¹⁻¹³	60n	I, 2	377, 390	5 ⁴⁻⁶	374
2 ^{16, 21ff}	390	I	377, 378	5 ^{5, 6}	376n
2 ¹⁹	47n, 167n, 299, 300,	I ¹⁻⁹	378	5 ⁶	373
	301, 304, 308	I ¹⁻⁵	376	5 ⁷⁻⁹	377n, 381
3 ¹⁻⁴	60n	I ¹⁻⁴	169n, 170, 208,	5 ⁷	383, 389
3 ¹⁻³	60		293, 400	5 ⁸	79n, 362n, 400
3 ¹	36n	I ¹	98, 387n	5 ^{9, 10}	382
3 ³	293n, 408n	I ³	38n, 177n, 362n, 376,	5 ^{11-63, 5^{11, 13}}	202
3 ⁴	167n		378, 379	5 ¹²⁻¹⁴	33n
3 ⁶	60n, 135n		378n, 379	6 ^{1, 2}	203
3 ¹⁵	154n, 293n, 300		378n, 379	6 ^{4ff}	398
3 ^{16, 18, 20, 4^{7, 17}}	293n		378, 379	6 ^{1, 5}	233n
1 Thessalonians (Thess.)			271n, 272n	6 ⁴	66, 75n, 344n
	7n, 253		378n, 379	6 ⁶	341n
1 ^{9, 10, 4¹⁶}	253		378n	6 ¹⁴⁻⁸¹	374
1 ¹⁰	253, 381n		376n, 378	6 ¹⁸⁻²⁰	381n
2 ¹⁸	161n		381, 400	6 ^{19, 20}	377
4 ¹⁶⁻¹⁷	269		377n	6 ²⁰	379n, 385
5 ¹⁻¹⁰	176n		379	7	393
5 ⁴⁻¹⁰	197n		378	7 ²	384, 388
5 ²⁸	266, 268		395n & ff, 428n	7 ³	376n
2 Thessalonians	7n		398	7 ¹⁴	373n
2 ¹⁸	204n		397	7 ¹⁶	170
3 ⁶	70n		378, 379, 381, 396,	7 ^{23-28, 7^{21, 25}}	385
1 Timothy (Tim.)			397, 400n	7 ²⁵	377
2 ⁸	306		380	7 ²⁶	197n
3 ¹⁶	56n		403n	7 ²⁷	384n
			386	7 ²⁸	378n, 385
			380, 396, 397, 403	8-10	393
			376	8 ^{1-9¹⁶}	375

	PAGES		PAGES		PAGES
8 ²	390, 391	10 ²⁶	398n	I ⁶	240n
8 ⁵	375n, 390, 391	10 ²¹	391	I ^{10, 11}	200n
8 ⁹	395n	10 ²²⁻³⁹	399n	I ¹³⁻¹⁶	204
8 ¹³	170	10 ²²⁻³⁴	36	I ¹³	203
9, 10	393	10 ²³	392	I ¹⁵	205
9	390, 392	11	276, 379, 398	I ¹⁷⁻²¹	206, 207
9 ¹⁻¹⁴	391	11 ^{1, 2, 6}	398n	I ¹⁷	204, 206
9 ¹⁻¹⁰	391, 393	11 ³	398	I ¹⁸⁻²⁰	204, 205
9 ¹⁻⁹ , 9 ¹⁰	390	11 ^{9, 10}	390	I ^{18, 21}	200
9 ^{2, 3, 6-9}	390	11 ⁹	392	I ¹⁸	204, 205
9 ⁷	373n	11 ¹⁷⁻¹⁹	281	I ^{19, 20}	206
9 ⁹	391	11 ²⁴⁻²⁷	30	I ²¹	200, 206, 207, 249n
9 ¹¹⁻²⁸	168n	11 ²⁴⁻²⁶	36, 392, 402n	I ²²⁻²⁷	207
9 ¹¹⁻¹⁷	393	11 ²⁶	30, 343n, 398n, 400	I ^{25, 28, 4¹¹}	207
9 ¹¹⁻¹⁵	373n	11 ²⁷	398	2	207n
9 ¹¹⁻¹⁴	165	11 ^{32-12¹}	399n	2 ¹⁻¹	208
9 ^{11, 24}	390	12	379, 399	2 ¹	38n, 208nn
9 ¹¹	390, 391	12 ¹⁻¹¹	379, 381n, 399n,	2 ²	357n
9 ¹²	170, 380, 384n		446	2 ³	208n
9 ^{13, 14}	169, 389	12 ^{1, 2}	399	3 ¹⁷	203n, 240n
9 ¹³	171, 389	12 ^{2, 3, 21}	398n		
9 ¹⁴	167n, 168n, 169n,	12 ²	30, 343n, 344n, 379	I Peter (Pet.)	195, 198,
	171, 233n, 391	12 ^{22ff}	390		200-203, 205, 206,
9 ¹⁵⁻²²	392, 393	12 ²²⁻²⁴	36, 373n, 386		214, 233, 344, 408
9 ¹⁵⁻¹⁸	49n	12 ²²	388	I ¹	199n, 203
9 ¹⁵⁻¹⁷	384n, 393	12 ²¹	168n, 385n, 398n,	I ^{2, 14, 22}	199 & n
9 ^{15, 17, 20}	393		422n	I ²	168n, 406, 422n
9 ¹⁸⁻²⁸ , 9 ¹⁸⁻²²	393	12 ²⁸	391	I ³⁻¹³	346n
9 ^{19, 22}	169n	13	392, 393	I ^{3, 4}	195ff
9 ^{21, 22}	387n	13 ⁸⁻¹⁰	388ff, 390, 392	I ^{3, 21}	195
9 ²¹	390	13 ⁸⁻¹⁰	392	I ^{3, 23}	201
9 ^{24-10²²}	375	13 ^{8, 9}	389	I ³	195, 196 & n, 197n,
9 ²⁴⁻²⁸	373n	13 ^{8, 12, 13, 20}	398n		199, 200, 233n,
9 ²⁸	382n, 406	13 ⁹	390		359n, 401
10 ¹⁻¹⁰	447n	13 ¹⁰⁻¹⁶	357n, 387, 388,	I ⁴⁻⁹	197, 198
10 ¹⁻⁴	393		393	I ⁷	82n, 198n
10 ¹	383n	13 ¹⁰⁻¹⁴	387	I ^{8, 1¹³}	198 & nn
10 ²	391	13 ^{10, 11}	387n, 422n	I ¹⁰⁻¹²	199, 415n
10 ⁵⁻¹⁸	393	13 ^{10, 15}	387n	I ^{11, 21, 1¹³⁻¹⁷}	199
10 ⁵⁻¹⁰	396	13 ¹⁰	388, 390, 391, 394,	I ^{16, 17}	199
10 ^{5-7, 8-14, 12}	383		408n	I ¹⁸⁻²¹	199, 405
10 ^{5, 10¹¹}	384	13 ¹¹	373n	I ^{18, 19}	42n, 168n
10 ¹⁰	384n, 389	13 ¹²	389	I ¹⁹⁻²¹	199
10 ^{19ff}	171	13 ¹³	36, 392	I ²¹	197, 198, 406
10 ¹⁹⁻²⁵	170, 373n, 386,	13 ¹⁴	388	I ²³⁻²⁵	199-201
	393	13 ^{15, 16}	388, 392	I ²³	200, 213n, 218
10 ¹⁹⁻²²	11n, 373n	13 ¹⁵	392, 393	I ²⁵	200
10 ¹⁹	168n, 170	13 ¹⁶	10n, 19n, 24n	21ff, 2 ^{6, 7}	199nn
10 ²⁰	389	13 ^{20, 21}	385n	21-3	201, 344n
10 ²²⁻²⁵	171			2 ^{2, 3}	33n, 202
10 ²²	168n	James (Jas.)		2 ²	203n
10 ²⁵	393		203, 206, 208	24ff	16 & n
10 ^{26ff}	398	I ^{3, 11}	82nn	24, 5	202

	PAGES		PAGES		PAGES
2 ⁵ , 9	169n	2 ¹	356n	1 ⁵	23
2 ⁵	19n, 23, 315n	2 ²	129n, 168n	1 ⁸	296
2 ⁸⁻¹¹ , 2 ¹¹	199n	2 ¹⁸⁻²⁷	160	1 ¹⁴ , 15	406n
2 ⁹	185n, 195n, 208n	2 ²⁰ , 27	414n	1 ¹⁶	383n, 407
2 ¹⁹⁻²⁵	199n	2 ²⁰	161	1 ¹⁷ , 18	296, 297
2 ¹⁹⁻²⁴	382n	2 ²¹ , 25	162	1 ¹⁸	410n
2 ²¹⁻²⁵	217n, 406	2 ²⁴	161, 162	2 ¹² , 15, 16	407
2 ²⁴	44	2 ²⁷	162, 218	3 ⁷ , 8	417n
3 ¹⁸⁻²²	196, 197, 199 & n	2 ²⁹⁻³²	209	3 ¹⁰	365n, 381n
3 ¹⁸⁻²¹	280n	2 ²⁹⁻³²	162	4, 5	361
3 ¹⁸	56n, 432	3 ¹ , 5, 6	164	4	360
3 ¹⁹	196n	3 ⁵ , 8	167n	4 ⁸	387n
3 ²¹	196n, 233 & n	3 ⁷⁻¹² , 3 ²³ , 24, 4 ²	160	5	373n, 406n
4 ¹	130n	3 ⁹ , 10	164, 209	5 ⁶	407, 408, 410n
4 ⁶	432n	3 ⁹	173n, 200, 215n,	5 ⁹	42n
4 ¹²⁻¹⁶	37, 38, 199n		397n, 436n	5 ¹²⁻¹¹ , 7 ¹⁰ , 17	407
4 ¹⁴	37, 137n, 408n, 448n	3 ²⁴ , 4 ¹³	160, 419	6 ⁹⁻¹¹	408
		4 ⁶	160n	6 ⁹ , 10	385n
2 Peter		4 ⁷⁻¹⁰ , 4 ¹² , 16	419	6 ¹⁸	239n, 407
1 ⁴	172	4 ⁷ , 8	162n, 164, 209	7 ⁹⁻¹⁷	406
1 ¹⁶	246n	4 ⁹ , 10	68n, 164, 165,	7 ¹⁷	406 & n, 409n,
1 ¹⁷	247		166n, 167n, 429		416n, 417n
2 ⁹	381n	4 ¹⁰	129n, 168n	8 ⁸	239n
3 ¹²	193n	4 ¹³ , 16	423n	10 ⁸⁻¹¹	371n
3 ¹³	188	4 ¹⁷	44	12	407n
		4 ¹⁹	108	12 ^{off} , 20 ¹⁰	446
1 John	156, 158, 161,	5 ¹ , 4, 18	209	12 ⁹	247n
	169, 170, 209,	5 ¹ , 18	200	13 ¹¹	447n
	211, 397, 419, 450	5 ¹	211, 241	14 ⁴	204n
I	165, 440	5 ⁶⁻⁸	414n, 420	14 ¹¹	387n
1 ¹⁻⁴	162, 234n	5 ⁶	420n	15 ³	416
1 ¹⁻⁸	157n	5 ⁷ , 8	160	17 ¹⁴ , 19 ¹¹⁻²¹ , 20 ⁷⁻¹⁰	407n
1 ¹	157, 161	5 ¹¹ , 20	410n	18 ⁴	13n
1 ⁸⁻⁷	409n	5 ¹⁸	164, 397n, 436n	19 ^{11ff}	406n
1 ³ , 6, 7	156	5 ¹⁹	365n	19 ¹⁵ , 21	407
1 ³ , 7	372n	5 ²⁰	158-160, 164	21, 22	344n
1 ³	156, 157, 160-163,	2 John	161	21 ³	342n, 408
	356n, 358n, 364n,	v. 9	161n	21 ⁶ , 22 ⁴ , 17	344n
	419, 440n, 449	v. 11	13n	21 ¹¹ , 23	342, 407
1 ⁴	157n, 162	Jude		21 ²²⁻²²⁵	373n
1 ^{5ff}	162-164	v. 3	39n	21 ²²	318n, 342, 407
1 ⁶	13n, 163	Revelation (Rev.)	344,	22 ¹⁻⁵	344
1 ⁷⁻⁹	165, 166		373, 406-408,	22 ¹ , 2	91
1 ⁷	163, 167, 168n, 422n		409 & n, 448	22 ¹	320n, 407, 440n
1 ¹⁰	167			22 ¹³	296
2 ¹ , 2	165, 166n, 372n,	I	406 & n	22 ¹⁶	296n
	386n			22 ¹⁷ , 20	448

(II) PERSONS

- Abbott, T. K., 35*n*, 247*n*, 312*n*
 Ambrose, St., 237*n*
 Aristotle, 100
 Barth, K., 21*n*, 148*n*
 Bernard, J. H., 354, with *nn.* on 176,
 212-214, 217, 219, 229, 230, 247-
 249, 268, 314-319, 341, 351, 353,
 358, 367, 370, 371, 385, 409, 411,
 413, 426, 430
 Bigg, C., 197*n*
 Blenkin, G. W., 233*n*
 Bowman, A. A., 286, 287
 Briggs, C. A., 91*nn*, 360*n*, 373, 403*n*
 Brightman, F. E., 139*n*
 Brooke, A. E., 157*nn*, 161*n*, 211*n*, 212*n*,
 449, 450
 Brown, F., Driver, S. R., Briggs,
 C. A., 240*n*, 255*n*, 293*n*
 Brunner, E., 65*n*
 Burkitt, F. C., 247*n*
 Burney, C. F., 291*n*
 Burton, E. D., *nn.* on 32, 34, 49, 50,
 54, 67, 70, 71, 89, 114-116, 122,
 124, 149
 Butler, J., 263
 Chase, F. H., 358*n*
 Chrysostom, St., 449, 450
 Cirlot, F. L., 348*n*, 355, 451
 Clarke, W. K. L., 75*n*, 89*n*
 Connolly, R. H., 232*n*, 361*n*
 Creed, J. M., 347*n*, 355, 388, 389
 Curtis, G., viii
 Descartes, 286
 Dix, G., 233*n*, 361*n*
 Dodd, C. H., *nn.* on 9, 20, 33, 54, 69,
 121, 152, 190, 234, 299
 Driver, S. R., 223*n*, 240*n*
 Duncan, G. S., 116*n*, 119*n*
 Easton, B. S., 233*n*
 Ellicott, C. J., 449
 Field, F., 237*n*
 Frere, W. H., 361*n*
 Gavin, F., 357*n*
 Grensted, L. W., 75*n*, 84*n*
 Gwatkin, H. M., 233*n*
 Hauck, D. F., 449-451
 Hicks, F. C. N., 347*n*, 357*n*
 Hippolytus, St., 232-234
 Holt, E. B., 287
 Hoskyns, E. C., 3*n*, 148*n*, 354, 438*n*
 Hooker, R., 428*n*
 Jackson, F. J. Foakes, 72*n*
 Jones, M., 71*n*
 Justin, St., 233 & *n*
 Kittel, G., 189*n*, 285, 388, 449*ff*
 Knox, W. L., *nn.* on 111, 289-291,
 296, 299, 306, 337, 361
 Lagrange, M. J., 430*n*
 Lake, K., and Cadbury, H. J., *nn.* on
 5, 192, 193, 260, 356, 357
 Law, R., 211*n*, 212*n*
 Mason, A. J., 89*n*
 Michael, J. H., 168*n*
 Moffatt, J., viii, 78, 82, 83, 86, 93,
 206, 227, 233, 262-264 & *nn.*, 388,
 389, 393, 449, with *nn.* on 21, 108,
 111, 171, 174, 175, 254, 258, 306,
 323, 330, 335, 346, 395
 Moulton, J. H., and Milligan, G.,
 285, 449, with *nn.* on 93, 174,
 185, 237, 255, 340, 350, 351, 368,
 395
 Nairne, A., 388, 389, 392
 Nietzsche, F., 43*n*
 Oesterley, W. O. E., 348*n*, 357*nn*
 Pedersen, J., 264*n*
 Plato, 374
 Plummer, A., *nn.* on 27, 34, 35, 84,
 138, 139, 237
 Rawlinson, A. E. J., 291*n*, 330*n*
 Robertson, A., and Plummer, A.,
 68*n*, 77 & *n*, 88*n*, 93*nn*, 259*n*, 338*n*,
 340*n*, 449, 450
 Robinson, J. A., *nn.* on 47, 70, 84, 174,
 178, 232, 311, 312
 Ropes, J. H., 204*n*, 208*n*
 Sanday, W., and Headlam, A. C.,
 83 & *nn.*, with *nn.* on 9, 20, 22-24,
 63, 68, 79, 82, 92, 96, 121, 127, 179
 Schweitzer, A., 257*n*, 354, 393

Scott, E. F., 312ⁿ
 Selwyn, E. G., 332ⁿ
 Shand, A., 84ⁿ
 Skinner, J., 223ⁿ, 295
 Swete, H. B., 139ⁿ

Taylor, A. E., 286
 Taylor, V., 42ⁿ

Thayer, J. H., and C. L. W. Grimm,
 395ⁿ
 Thomas Aquinas, St., 263
 Toy, C. H., 293ⁿ
 Vincent, M. R., *nm.* on 31, 71, 74
 Wand, J. W. C., *nm.* on 196, 197, 202
 Westcott, B. F., 247ⁿ, 388

See also pp. xii, xiii.

(iii) SUBJECTS

Abraham. (1) faith of, 48-52, 235-238, 240ⁿ, 273, 276-279, 281; its pattern reproduced, 236 *ff.*, (2) seed of, 48-54, 59, 114, 173, 273, 274, 277, 281. *See also* faith
 Adam and Christ, last Adam, 58, 59, 92, 122, 131, 136, 142-147, 182, 218, 222-226, 261, 267-269, 272, 274-277, 283, 292, 295, 296, 313, 433ⁿ
 adoption, 114-117, 123, 127, 132, 134, 164ⁿ, 173 *ff.*, 181-187, 194, 195, 331, 346, 379, 447. *See also* sonship
 altar: Jewish, 375, 384, 387; Christian, 357ⁿ, 387-394; eucharistic, 345, 394; heavenly, 385ⁿ, 408; and table, 326
 analogy: from nature to the resurrection, 262-265, 285; between (a) eternal and created sonship, 397ⁿ, (b) Christ and David, 379ⁿ, (c) divine and human *koinonia*, 441, (d) the eucharist and other ritual meals, 326, 328, 332, 340ⁿ; of the O.T. cultus, 373, 384 (cp 334, *n.* 3); of dependence in John 6⁵⁷, 426; of personal relationships, 441, 442. *See also* integration
 anointing, 139-142, 140ⁿ, 145, 160-162, 183, 217, 218, 256, 268, 271, 272, 273, 275, 301, 367, 401, 414 & *n.*, 415, 434, 436, 440, 441, 443, 445, 447
archegos, 378, 379 & *n.*
 ascension, 85, 86, 196, 307, 356, 376, 430-434; cp. 91, 137
 atonement, 45, 98, 164-172, 375; cp. 143, 146, 155, 175, 181, 199, 387ⁿ, 392, 420, 422, 425. *See also* expiation, justification, sacrifice, etc

baptism. of Jesus, 127, 141, 175ⁿ, 217, 218, 227, 228, 232, 234, 272ⁿ, 292, 401, 409, 412-415, 420; of the new Israel, 227-229, 231-234, 241, 244-246, 280, 282; Christian, 449, 515, 57, 59-65, 87-89, 91-95, 105, 117, 118, 123, 127ⁿ, 130, 131, 139, 147, 185, 190-194, 196, 201, 202, 232-234, 241, 244, 280, 281, 331, 336, 344, 421; cp. 414, 416
 Baptist, St. John, 74, 217, 224, 227, 228, 234, 238, 409, 412-415, 415ⁿ, 420, 445, 447
 beginning, 162, 216, 291-297, 299ⁿ
 body: Hebrew view of, 254, 260, 264, 295, 298, 314, 331; Christian attitude towards, 15-21, 253-255, 331, 332, 408; and bride, 221 *ff.*, 254, 255, 273, 274, 300, 313, 440-442; spiritual, 60ⁿ, 266-270, 283, 301 *ff.*; risen, 283, 301-304, 425; mystical, 300, 301, 302, 304-314, 319-321, 335, 345; eucharistic, 335, 345, 425; discerning the, 342-345, 350, 352; cp. 446. *See also* Body of Christ, resurrection.
 Body of Christ, 18, 19, 21, 23ⁿ, 24, 40, 42, 46-48, 58, 70, 71, 92-95, 148 & *n.*, 154, 169, 255-257, 275, 280-282, 288, 295, 329, 342, 343, 408, 425, 443, 446, 450; aspects of, 297-306, 304, *n.* 2, 309ⁿ, 314-320, 330-332, 335, 336, 345, 395, 410, 423-425, 438, 440, 441, 446; and bodies of Christians, 15, 253-255
See also grace, organism, sanctuary, tabernacle, two centres of reference, unity.
 breaking of bread, 340ⁿ. *See also* *koinonia*

Christology of St. Paul, 112, 270-275, 289-297

Church: and (a) Christ, 440-448, (b) salvation, 92 (cp. 107), (c) Scripture, 2-4, 313*n*; as fulness of Christ, 306-313, 439; the primitive, chapter i. *See also* body, Body of Christ, head, *koinonia*, resurrection etc

coinherence, 105*n*, 294, 424

collection for Jerusalem, 8-10, 16, 17, 24*ff*

common life. *See koinonia*

communication, chain or scale of, 426*ff*, 429, 440, 443

communion, 71, 76, 157-160, 162-164, 327 *f*. *See also* eucharist, eucharistic, *koinonia*, sacrifice etc.

confirmation, 89*n*, 344

correspondence, point by point, 227, 228 & *n*. *See also* integration

creation and (a) Christ, 178, 289-297, (b) redemption, 358-361, 396-399, 425, (c) sonship in Christ, 174-183, 209, 358, 396, 397, 425, (d) the Church, 178, 297, (e) the eucharist, 361, 386, 387. *See also* sonship

creed: baptismal, 232, 243; Nicaeno-Constantinopolitan, 267*n*

Davidic king, 50*n*, 270-275, 290, 291, 373*f*, 376*f*, 379*n*, 382, 401

deification of man, 172, 403

descent into hell, 196, 307*n*

double polarity, 57-65, 64*n*, 107*n*, 121, 440 & *n*. *See also* two centres of reference

eschatological bread, 368 *ff*, crisis, 190, 191, 228, 280, 349, 350 & *nn*, 381; event, 193, goal, 329; repentance, 192

eschatology and (a) the new life, 7, 8, 181 *ff*, 188 *ff*, 197-199, 227, 228, 244, 245, 280-282, 333, 334*n*, 381, (b) baptism, 189-194, (c) the eucharist, 337, 345-350, 369 *See also* grace

eucharist, 190*n*, 229, 230, 244, 325-328, 330 *ff*, 334 *ff*, 343, 345, 355, 357, 386, 389, 393, 394; and 'the rock', 338*n*

eucharistic: acts, 388, associations, 330, 393; bread, 338; canon, 361, communion, 345; cup, 346 (cp. 347,

nn. 1, 5); food, 423; implication, 393; institution, 230, 348, 354, 355, 438, life, 350; reference, 392, 393; rite, 334; teaching, 435; words, 388; worship, 4, 393

See also altar, body, Body of Christ (aspects of), eschatological, eschatology, last supper, sacrifice, sacramental

eucharistic discourse, 352-354, 421-424, 425-430; and baptismal discourse, 430-437

eudokia, 175*n*

expiation, 59, 69, 98, 102, 129, 164-166, 168, 380, 409, 425, 429, 447. *See also* atonement

faith: and (a) signs, 247-249, (b) sonship, 115, 116, 124, (c) the new birth, 209-212, 416; of Mary, 236-238; confession of, 232-234, 243, 244; foundation of, 235-241, object of, 154-156, 241, pattern of, 236, process of 234, 235, 241-245 *See also* form of belief, integration, *koinonia*

firstborn, 204-206, 290-293, 310, 379, 380. *See also* Christology of St. Paul

firstfruits, 183-186, 204, 206, 261, 262, 264, 265, 297, 336*ff*, 345, 379*n*, 447, 448

flesh of Jesus, 431-437, 441-443, 445-447

form of belief, 243, 244, 257-259, 278-280

grace: and (a) election, 173, (b) eschatology, 198, (c) gifts, 21, (d) justification, 87, 92, 279, (e) the Body of Christ, 107, (f) truth, 162, 212, 213, 304, 345; of God, 27, 32, 140, 159, 175, 179, 223, of Christ, 28-31, 67-70, 92, 155; in Christ, 181; bestowed by Christ, 438; its source, (a) Christ, 447, (b) the Spirit, 69, state of, 79, 92, 94, 118, 132, 198, 279; fall from, 333

grafting, 61-65, 112, 121-125, 135, 144-148, 153, 154, 156, 168, 196, 274, 275, 280, 331

haburah, 335*n*, 348*n*, 355, 451

head, Christ as, 23*n*, 40, 42, 47, 178, 181, 221-226, 268, 273-275, 277, 289, 295-300, 302, 304, 306-308, 321, 331, 379, 440, 441, 451

heart, biblical meaning of, 97ⁿ, 103 *ff*, 118, 176, 249

heresy: Colossian, 289, 305, 378, 390, docetic-gnostic, 389, 414 & *n*, 420-423

Holy Spirit: and (a) anointing, 160, 161, (b) baptism, 86-89, 93-95, 118, 139, (c) filial response, 118-121, 125-127, 142, (d) flesh, 218, 433, 434, 443, (e) the ascended Lord, 91, 137, 448, (f) the bride, 448, (g) the indwelling Christ, 135-145, (h) the Lamb, 217, 411-419, 421, 434, 440ⁿ, 445, 447, (i) the new creation, 215-219, (j) the new sanctuary, 14-16, 18, 19, 27, 37, 38 (cp. 172), (k) the O.T. 89-91, 112 & *n*, 215-218 & *nn*, (l) the truth, 160, 411, 412, 418, (m) unity, 94, 441, (n) wisdom, 106-113; as substance and person, 450; activity of, 93-95, 125; earnest of, 139, 183-187, 285, gift of, 74-76, 78, 81-92, 96, 104, 105, 110, 113, 118, 120, 124, 125ⁿ, 127, 138, 139, 156, 186, 196, 416, 417, 419, 432, 433; law of, 128-132, 135, 145; outpouring of, 39, 74, 85-90, 92, 104, 105, 117, 126, 145, 183, 185, 194, 319; sending of, 114, 116-121, 124-126. *See also* anointing, baptism, firstfruits, *koinonia*, Pentecost, resurrection.

Holy Trinity, 66, 321, 427, 440-442. *See also* coinherence

identity: in distinction, 299 *ff*, 314, 335-337, of Christ and his members, 40, 44-48, 280-282, 305, 314, 319, 331, 386, 423, 424, 439, 441; of essence, 265, with which cp. 262, 270, 285, 301; of love, 440-442. *See also* Body of Christ (aspects of), organism

idolatry, 84, 171, 323 *ff*, 328, 333, 334, 338

Ignatian writings, 389

incarnation: and (a) atonement, 428, 429 (cp. 164), (b) flesh, 380, 432, 433, (c) *koinonia*, 16, 45, 162, 416, 440, (d) mission, 366, (e) the O.T. 403, (f) the apostles, 443, 444, (g) the Church, 315, 444, (h) the new birth, 209-217, 397, (i) the eucharist, 431-433, (j) worship, 411, 415,

425; as sphere of contrasts, 400, 442; purpose of, 122, 164 & *n*, 395; two aspects of, 402. *See also* deification, flesh of Jesus, one flesh, heresy

integration: of faith, 283; of life, 1, 15-21, 388; of truths, 387 & *nn*, 422, cp. 138, 304, *n* 1, 394, 415

Judas, 231, 316, 341, 347, 350-353

justification, 54-56, 68, 69, 78 *ff*, 87, 92, 96, 102, 103, 130 *ff*, 190, 227, 276-279

kenotic speculations, 168ⁿ

kerygma, 68ⁿ, 361ⁿ

kiddush, 334ⁿ, 347ⁿ

koinonia: 1-17, 21, 24 & *n*, 26, 27 & *nn*, 28, 31-33 & *nn*, 36, 38 *ff*, 47, 66, 136, 156-165, 169-172, 234 & *nn*, and (a) Christ's sacrifice, 418, (b) the Church, 92, (c) the breaking of bread, 6, 322 *ff*, 332, 356, 372, 392, (d) 'the common', 10 *f*, 171, 172, 177; meaning of, 16, 31, 71-76, 158-160, 327, 449-451; fourfold conception of, 163, 164; of Christ, 14, 71, 75, 91, 334, of the Spirit, 67, 69-78, 80, 84ⁿ, 91, 160, 329; of Christ's body, 154; of sufferings, 34-37; of faith, 38, 39; of light and of darkness, 11, 13; of demons, 322 *f*, 334; of evil, 58; the divine, 158, 162, 251, 313, 364, 397, 403, 410, 438, 440, 441, the divine-human, 225, 313, two aspects of, 76-78, 392, two ways of describing, 75-78, 91, 113, 114. *See also* analogy, incarnation, parallelism, sacrificial

Lamb of God: 199, 228, 229, 232, 234, 320, 342-344, 347, 361, 396, 405-418, 409ⁿ, 420-422, 445-448; and waters of new creation, 217, 218, 414, 417, 421; Christology epitomized, 417ⁿ. *See also* Holy Spirit, passover, serpent, servant.

last supper, 325, 334, 340 & *n*, 341, 346-352, 354, 355

looking-glass theology, 84

manna, 333 & *n*, 337, 338, 352

marvellous works, 240 & *n*, 248, 279, 282, 359-361

Melchizedek, 373 & *n*, 374, 376ⁿ, 377, 382, 384, 393

Messiah: and (a) *ecclesia*, 225, 227, 255, 256, 273, 300, 336, 341, (b) resurrection, 261, 262, 267, 270-275, (c) Servant, 434; love of, 46, reproach of, 30, 36, 276, 343, 398, 399, 408; sufferings of, 34-38, 199, 303-305, 330, 332, 401, 448

metechem, 322, 449, 450

mission and consecration, 363-368, 395 ff, 403, 430, 434

Mosaic law and Christ, 48-51, 114-116, 128-133, 146-153, 280, 281, 373-377, 383-387, 390-393, 404, 445-447

naos, 318

one flesh, 222-226, 254, 255, 313-316, 442, 443

One Man, 4, 49, 55, 57, 59, 63, 64ⁿ, 92, 140, 142, 254, 256, 257, 261, 273, 274, 288, 295, 298, 302, 308, 313-315, 320, 321, 329, 331, 336, 345, 404, 439ⁿ, 444ⁿ See also organism

organism: the human, 147, 264, 270; of Christ, (a) physical, 262, 265, (b) spiritual, 321; its place in Christology, 320, 321; the new organism of the One Man Jesus Christ, 57, 58, 64ⁿ, is messianic, 46, 256; as the Body of Christ, 19, 58, 332, it is the organism of his whole redemptive action, 394, and sacrificial response, 425; as the divine-human organism, 314, 317, 320, it is the risen Lord, 419, but has double polarity, 64ⁿ, 440; for, as the organism of the new Israel, 336, 364, it is a new creation, 18, of redeemed humanity, 19; and we are its extension, 342; its unity includes plurality of (a) aspects and distinctions, 295-302, 314, 317, 410, and (b) members, 49, 92, 94, 256, 288, 336. See also sacrificial, unity.

paradidomi, 229ⁿ; cp. 53, *n*. 1, 55, *n*. 5, 155, *n*. 3, 225ⁿⁿ, 284, 306ⁿ

paradosis: 355, 444 & *n*; two meanings of, 340, 341. See also *paradidomi*

parallelism between (a) Christ and his members, 137 & *n*, (b) Christ and the believer, 425-430, (c) the two missions, 126, (d) two ways of describing the *koinonia*, 77, 78

passover: 325, 333, 334ⁿ, 347, 421-423; Christian, 325, 342, 347, 422, 447

Pentecost, 85 ff, 104, 105, 125, 126, 185, 190-194, 219ⁿ, 227, 234, 244, 272, 303, 319, 445, 448

place, 299 & *n*

pleroma, 306ⁿ, 309ⁿ, 310ⁿ

prayer: high-priestly, 363-368, 438 ff, 443; Lord's, 357, 358 & *n*, 359 ff, 368, 370, 372, 380, 381; prayers of Christ, 357, 358 & *nn*, 402

priesthood: and sacrifice, 23, 394; of Christ, 165, 171, 226-228, 363, 372-378, 380, 382-386, 393, 394, 407, 425; of St. Paul, 23; in the Body of Christ, 23. See also altar, Mosaic law, sacrifice, sacrificial

quickenings, 436, 441, and page reff. under 267. *n*. 5

refreshment and light, 104ⁿ, 105, 344, 353

resurrection: of Christ, 18, 35ⁿ, 189, 195-199, 254, 257 ff, 272, 275-284, 297, 298, 301-304, 317-319, 419, 423-425, 433, 445, 447, 448; of the body, 15, 181-187, 253-255, 260 ff, 275, 284-286; and (a) messianic sonship, 271-273 & *nn*, (b) the Holy Spirit, 183-187, 285, (c) the Church, 253, 254, 280-284, 445-448, (d) regeneration, 195-201, (e) the eucharist, 423-425

sabbath-rest, 382 & *nn*, 385

sacrament: their nature, 331, 336, 427-431

sacrifice: ancient and modern ideas of, 326 ff; animal, 19, 20; cult-, 328; non-Christian, 326; of Abraham, 281, 393; of Christ, 44, 229, 231, 250, 251, 312, 313, 327, 330, 336, 341, 342-345, 354, 363, 364, 372, 373, 376, 383-388, 391, 392, 394, 408, 409-411, 415, 417, 421, 425, 428, 447; cup of, 228ⁿ, 249, 328; and the risen life, 303-306; and communion, 326-328, 410; Christian, 19-25, 44, 245, 288, 327, 330-332; of faith, 329, 330; self-, 28, 98-100, 327. See also analogy (of O.T. cultus), Mosaic law, passover

sacrificial. action, 19, 44, 343, 394, 395, 396; act(s), 19, 340*n*; approach and entry, 386; body, 448; blood, 166, 168, 340; character, 392; communion, 326, cultus, 19, 326, 329, death, 246, 303, 304, 330, 331, 383; feasts (meals), 323-328, 340*n*, 357, 388, 389, 392; food, 326; glory, 372, 429; ideas (ancient), 304, *n.* 1, *koinoma*, 169, 364; language, 23, libation, (a) pagan, 328-330, (b) of Christ, 167, 168, 303, 329, 330, (c) of St. Paul, 328-330, 332; life, 23, 305, 306, 328, 330, 336, 337, 342, 343, 354, 423; love, 304, 308, 312, 344; mission, 395, 430; organism, 329, 332, 342, 408, 410, 419; outpouring, 329, 330, 332; pleading, 386; power, 394; presence, 345; reference, 25; response, 312, 345, 412, 425, 428, 429; service, 363; sufferings, 407; victim, 226, 227, 342, 384, 392, 407, 422; words, 245, 249. *See also* atonement, eucharist, expiation, priesthood, sanctuary

sanctorum communio, 158

sanctuary, 14, 19, 38, 314*n*, 317; and (a) camp of Israel, 344, (b) lamp, 342, 344, 407-409, (c) sacrifice, 344, 345, 409, 410, 448; of Christ's body, 318, 320, 421. *See also* shrine, tabernacle

second coming, 198, 345, 346, 448. *See also* eschatology etc.

serpent, the brazen, 231, 241, 247, 250-252, 353; and the servant, 250-252 & *nn*, 316; and the Lamb, 413, 428, 445-448

servant, the suffering, 53-56, 133, 134, 140*n*, 141, 142, 155, 165, 166, 175*n*, 217*nn*, 225-227, 228*n*, 245, 246, 250-252 & *nn*, 257, 273, 279, 284, 285, 316, 349, 351, 362, 401, 404-407, 409 & *n*, 413, 416, 420, 422, 434, 447

Shekinah, 37, 79, 172, 314*n*, 320, 342, 344, 360, 448

shrine, 12, 15; and camp, 315, and congregation, 317

sin, 13, 14, 18; as: a fall, 294; darkness, 162, 163; debt, 166; disease, 58; disintegration, 94, 95, 222; hostility to God, 102; slavery, 128-131; uncleanness, 166, 167, 172, gener-

ation of, 204, 205; domain of, 147, 151-153; wages of, 134; weeds of, 206; sin and death, 143, 144; sin of Israel, 192, 193; at Corinth, 334, 337-343; in Christ's body, 446; freedom from, 131-133; the sinless One, 43, 55, 129, 130, 164, became sin, 55, 281, 445; to deal with sin, 129-131, and keep us from sin, 164; Christ's victory over sin, 146, shared by us, 147-155; sin: and the resurrection, 260, 261, 265; and forgiveness, 119, 120, 166, 372; and grace, 79; and glory, 79, 292. *See also* Adam, atonement, expiation, grace, justification, sacrifice

soma, 318

sonship, 51, 114 *ff*; in the Son, 156, 158-160, 164, 168, 173, 358, 380, 396, 397; and (a) God's love, 118-126, 174, (b) election, 173, 175*n*, (c) predestination, 115*n*, 174, 186, 396, (d) creation, 115*n*, 172, 181, 209, 380, 396, 397, 403, 405, 436, 437*n*, (e) slavery, 115 & *n*, 116, 117, 122-135, (f) suffering, 395-401, (g) resurrection, 183-187. *See also* adoption, creation, incarnation (and the new birth)

tabernacle: Mosaic, 13, 37, 314 & *n*, 318, 320, 375, 377, 387, 388, 390, 391; heavenly, 385-388, 390, 391; Mary became a, 320; of the Word, 314, 318, of God, 408; and (a) Wisdom, 314, 315, (b) the congregation 315 (c) the camp, 342

transfiguration, 244-247, 292, 320, 413, 445

two centres of reference, 345

two stages in (a) grafting and (b) adoption, 61-65, 121-125, 144-146, 187; cp. 439 with *n.* 2

unity: and (a) glory, 439, (b) Christ's sacrifice, 342, (c) sacraments, 336, 338; in St. John's Gospel, 439*n*; organic in the new creation, 19; of a natural organism typifies Christ's human organism, 94; of Christ's body, 94, 167, 288, 336; (i) its source and (ii) its two aspects in the Body of Christ, 441

vine, the true, 167ⁿ, 245, 282, 302,
 314, 315, 318, 319, 321, 364, 366,
 368, 370, 412, 437, 439, 441, 442,
 444ⁿ
 virgin-birth and new birth, 236, 436
 & ²_n

Virgin Mother, 310. *See also* faith,
 tabernacle

Wisdom of God, 106-112, 291 & *m.*
 293 & *m.*, 299 & *n.*, 1, 306, *n.* 2,
 337, *n.* 3, 344. *See also* tabernacle

See also pp. ix-xi